


For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Dzurko1970>

FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THEIR
PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS
OF THEIR COMMUNITIES

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

MASTER OF EDUCATION IN

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION



MARSHALL DZURKO

FALL, 1970

Thesis
1970 F
71

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFY THAT THEY HAVE READ, AND
RECOMMEND TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES FOR ACCEPT-
ANCE, A THESIS ENTITLED "FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND
THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR
COMMUNITIES" SUBMITTED BY MARSHALL DZURKO IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER
OF EDUCATION.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. THE PROBLEM

The problem of finding the minimum of a function $f(x)$ over a set S is a fundamental problem in optimization. In this chapter, we will consider the case where $f(x)$ is a convex function and S is a convex set. The minimum of $f(x)$ over S is called the global minimum of $f(x)$ over S . If $f(x)$ is not convex, then the minimum of $f(x)$ over S may not be unique. In this case, we will consider the problem of finding a local minimum of $f(x)$ over S . A local minimum of $f(x)$ over S is a point x^* in S such that $f(x^*) \leq f(x)$ for all x in S in a neighborhood of x^* . The problem of finding a local minimum of $f(x)$ over S is called the local minimum problem. In this chapter, we will consider the problem of finding a local minimum of $f(x)$ over S when $f(x)$ is a convex function and S is a convex set. This problem is called the convex optimization problem. The convex optimization problem is a special case of the local minimum problem. In this chapter, we will consider the problem of finding a local minimum of $f(x)$ over S when $f(x)$ is a convex function and S is a convex set. This problem is called the convex optimization problem. The convex optimization problem is a special case of the local minimum problem.

ABSTRACT

THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF THE STUDY WAS TO EXAMINE THE EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES; AND TO TEST SPECIFIC HYPOTHESES PERTAINING TO RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND SELECTED VARIABLES.

DATA FOR THIS RESEARCH WERE GATHERED THROUGH A QUESTIONNAIRE. NAMES OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS OF COUNTIES, SCHOOL DIVISIONS, AND LARGER SCHOOL DISTRICTS WERE OBTAINED FROM SUPERINTENDENTS OF THEIR SCHOOL UNITS. A QUESTIONNAIRE ALONG WITH A SELF-ADDRESSED AND STAMPED ENVELOPE WAS FORWARDED TO ALL FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAD DISCONTINUED THEIR BOARD SERVICE AT SOME TIME DURING THE PAST TEN YEARS. THE RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONS OF THIS INSTRUMENT WERE THE BASIS FOR THE FINDINGS WHICH FOLLOW.

WHILE SOME FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS APPEARED TO PLAY A SOMEWHAT INACTIVE ROLE AFTER THEIR SERVICE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD, THE RESPONSES INDICATED THAT MANY OF THESE EXPERIENCED INDIVIDUALS CONTINUED TO BE INFLUENTIAL IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES.

THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS INDICATED THAT MOST WERE RESIDENTS OF MANY YEARS IN THEIR COMMUNITIES. TWO-THIRDS HAD NOT SOUGHT RE-ELECTION. OVER 88 PER CENT HAD NOT BEEN ELECTED TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL POSITIONS; 29

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THIS STUDY WOULD PROBABLY HAVE NEVER BEEN REALIZED HAD IT NOT BEEN FOR THE GUIDANCE AND ASSISTANCE THAT THE WRITER RECEIVED FROM HIS THESIS SUPERVISOR, DR. DAVID FRIESEN, OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION. DR. FRIESEN'S GENEROSITY IN SHARING HIS KNOWLEDGE AND PROVIDING THE INSPIRATION MADE THIS RESEARCH A REALITY. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ARE ALSO CONVEYED TO DR. C. S. BUMBARGER AND DR. T. AOKI FOR STUDYING THE RESEARCH AND SERVING ON THE ORAL EXAMINATION COMMITTEE. APPRECIATION IS EXPRESSED TO MY BROTHER, VIC, FOR SERVING AS A CONTACT POINT AND TO HIS WIFE, HELEN, FOR MAKING THEIR HOME AVAILABLE TO ME THROUGHOUT MY SUMMER SCHOOL GRADUATE PROGRAM. THANKS ARE DUE TO MRS. B. R. ZWICKER FOR TYPING THIS THESIS ON SUCH SHORT NOTICE. A SPECIAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT IS ALSO CONVEYED TO MY WIFE, SONIA, ALONG WITH MY THREE CHILDREN, FOR THEIR PATIENCE AND UNDERSTANDING THROUGHOUT THE WRITER'S GRADUATE PROGRAM. THEY PROVIDED THAT MUCH-NEEDED MOTIVATION, ENCOURAGEMENT, AND TOLERATION WHICH MADE POSSIBLE THE DEMANDING TASK. TO ALL THESE INDIVIDUALS, I AM MOST GRATEFUL AND INDEBTED.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----|
| LIST OF TABLES | x i |
| FOREWORD | x v |
| CHAPTER | |
| I THE PROBLEM | 1 |
| DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN BOARD OF EDUCATION | 1 |
| PURPOSES OF SCHOOL BOARD | 8 |
| THE PROBLEM | 10 |
| PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY | 11 |
| DEFINITION OF TERMS | 13 |
| II REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 15 |
| III RESEARCH DESIGN | 25 |
| DESIGN OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE | 25 |
| PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES INFORMATION | 26 |
| SCORING | 30 |
| THE SURVEY | 32 |
| IDENTIFYING AND CONTACTING FORMER BOARD MEMBERS | 32 |
| VARIABLES IDENTIFIED AND PROPOSITIONS SUGGESTED | 35 |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| HYPOTHESES | 37 |
| OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION | 37 |
| BOARD CHARACTERISTICS | 39 |
| INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS | 41 |
| FACTORS RELATED TO BOARD SERVICE | 42 |
| PERSONAL FACTORS | 44 |
| SUMMARY | 46 |
| IV CHARACTERISTICS OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, THEIR SCHOOL SYSTEMS, AND THEIR COMMUNITIES | 49 |
| CHARACTERISTICS OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS | 50 |
| AGE OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER | 50 |
| LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT | 50 |
| OCCUPATIONS OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS | 51 |
| PARENTAL INTEREST (CHILDREN IN SCHOOL) OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS | 52 |
| TENURE OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS | 53 |
| RECENCY OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE | 53 |
| METHODS OF SELECTING SCHOOL BOARD CANDIDATES | 54 |
| REASONS FOR SEEKING SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERSHIP | 55 |
| RETIREMENT FROM SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE | 56 |
| PREVIOUS INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS | 57 |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN SCHOOL DISTRICT | 58 |
| PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE AS AN EDUCATOR | 59 |
| ELECTION TO OTHER PUBLIC GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY AFTER SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE | 59 |
| APPOINTED TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL BOARD | 60 |
| CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR SCHOOL DISTRICTS | 61 |
| INCUMBENCY OF SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS | 61 |
| NUMBER OF BOARD MEMBERS ON YOUR LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD | 62 |
| MEMBERSHIP IN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS | 62 |
| SEX OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER | 63 |
| NUMBER OF CURRENT SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS YOU SERVED WITH | 64 |
| EXISTENCE OF MAJOR CONTROVERSY IN SCHOOL DISTRICT | 64 |
| MAJOR CONTROVERSY | 65 |
| BOARD ENCOURAGEMENT FOR FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TO REMAIN ACTIVE | 66 |
| CHARACTERISTICS OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS | 67 |
| TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT | 67 |
| SIZE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT | 67 |
| SCHOOL BOARD POLICY-MAKING PROCESS | 68 |
| CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES | 69 |
| COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE | 69 |
| SUMMARY | 70 |

| | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| V | PARTICIPATION OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES | 71 |
| | PARTICIPATION IN INFORMATION-SEEKING ACTIVITIES | 72 |
| | PARTICIPATION IN ADVICE-GIVING ACTIVITIES | 77 |
| | PARTICIPATION IN CAMPAIGNING ACTIVITIES | 80 |
| | DIRECT PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES | 82 |
| | COMMENTS | 85 |
| | SUMMARY | 90 |
| VI | SELECTED VARIABLES AND PARTICIPATION | 93 |
| | OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION | 94 |
| | SUMMARY OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION | 100 |
| | BOARD CHARACTERISTICS | 101 |
| | SUMMARY OF BOARD CHARACTERISTICS | 105 |
| | INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS | 105 |
| | FACTORS RELATING TO BOARD SERVICE | 108 |
| | SUMMARY OF FACTORS RELATING TO BOARD SERVICE | 114 |
| | PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS | 114 |
| | SUMMARY OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS | 121 |
| | CHAPTER SUMMARY | 122 |

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----|
| VII SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 124 |
| PURPOSE OF STUDY | 124 |
| THE EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION | 124 |
| FACTORS AFFECTING PARTICIPATION | 128 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS | 130 |
| AREAS FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH | 131 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 133 |
| APPENDIX A | 137 |
| APPENDIX B | 139 |
| APPENDIX C | 141 |
| APPENDIX D | 143 |
| APPENDIX E | 144 |
| APPENDIX F | 145 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I | AGE OF RESPONDENTS | 50 |
| II | LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF RESPONDENTS | 51 |
| III | OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENTS | 52 |
| IV | PARENTAL INTEREST OF RESPONDENTS | 52 |
| V | TENURE OF RESPONDENTS | 53 |
| VI | RECENCY OF BOARD SERVICE OF RESPONDENTS | 54 |
| VII | METHOD BY WHICH RESPONDENTS BECAME BOARD MEMBERS | 55 |
| VIII | REASONS FOR SEEKING MEMBERSHIP ON BOARD | 56 |
| IX | RETIREMENT FROM BOARD SERVICE | 57 |
| X | PREVIOUS INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS | 58 |
| XI | LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN SCHOOL DISTRICT | 59 |
| XII | PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE AS AN EDUCATOR | 59 |
| XIII | ELECTED TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL POSITION AFTER SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE | 60 |
| XIV | APPOINTED TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL POSITION AFTER SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE | 61 |
| XV | BOARD SERVICE UNDER CURRENT SUPERINTENDENT | 61 |

| | | |
|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| XXXV | PARTICIPATION BY SUPERINTENDENT INCUMBENCY | 98 |
| XXXVI | PARTICIPATION BY SIZE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT | 100 |
| XXXVII | PARTICIPATION BY TYPE OF SCHOOL BOARD | 102 |
| XXXVIII | PARTICIPATION BY BOARD CONTROVERSY | 103 |
| XXXIX | PARTICIPATION BY DISTRICT ENCOURAGEMENT FOR PARTICIPATION | 103 |
| XL | PARTICIPATION BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT | 104 |
| XLI | PARTICIPATION BY PREVIOUS INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS | 106 |
| XLII | PARTICIPATION BY APPOINTMENT TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES | 107 |
| XLIII | PARTICIPATION BY ELECTION TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES | 107 |
| XLIV | PARTICIPATION BY METHODS USED TO SELECT SCHOOL BOARD CANDIDATES | 109 |
| XLV | PARTICIPATION BY REASONS FOR RUNNING FOR SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION | 110 |
| XLVI | PARTICIPATION BY RETIREMENT METHOD | 111 |
| XLVII | PARTICIPATION BY TIME SERVED ON SCHOOL BOARDS | 112 |
| XLVIII | PARTICIPATION BY RECENCY OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE | 113 |
| XLIX | PARTICIPATION BY CHRONOLOGICAL AGE OF RESPONDENTS | 115 |
| L | PARTICIPATION BY SEX OF INDIVIDUAL | 116 |

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| LI | PARTICIPATION BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION | 117 |
| LII | PARTICIPATION BY PARENTAL INTEREST | 118 |
| LIII | PARTICIPATION BY METHOD BY WHICH BOARD MEMBER OBTAINED HIS POSITION | 119 |
| LIV | PARTICIPATION BY FORMER EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE | 120 |
| LV | PARTICIPATION BY TIME RESIDED IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS | 121 |

"AFTER TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF DEVOTED AND DEDICATED
SERVICE.....MUCH TRAVEL IN CONNECTION WITH SCHOOLS.....
OFTEN SACRIFICING MY FAMILY AND FARMING ENTERPRISE.....
OCCASIONALLY CAUSING CONFLICT IN MY SOCIAL CIRCLES BECAUSE
OF MY STAND ON PARTICULAR EDUCATIONAL ISSUES.....LIVING
EDUCATION.....IT WAS A VERY EMPTY FEELING TO RETIRE....
..AND TO BE IMMEDIATELY FORGOTTEN.....NO INVITATIONS....
..NO AGENDAS.....NOTHING.....AS IS THE CUSTOM OF OUR
SMALL RURAL DIVISION."

- COMMENT FROM FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER.

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN BOARD OF EDUCATION

IDEAS ON OUR EARLIEST SCHOOLS WERE IMPORTED FROM EUROPE BY THE COLONISTS WHO SETTLED ON THE ATLANTIC COAST, ON WHAT IS GENERALLY CALLED THE THIRTEEN ATLANTIC COLONIES. CANADIAN EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS ARE, MORE THAN ANYWHERE ELSE, TO BE FOUND IN NEW ENGLAND. AS EARLY AS 1642, THE MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT ENVISIONED THE NEED FOR TAKING STEPS TO INSURE THAT ALL MASSACHUSETTS' CITIZENS WERE TAUGHT TO READ AND WRITE. THEN THE MASSACHUSETTS LAW OF 1647 REQUIRED EVERY TOWN TO PROVIDE SCHOOLS. THE LAW ORDERED:

1. THAT EVERY TOWN HAVING FIFTY HOUSEHOLDERS SHOULD AT ONCE APPOINT A TEACHER OF READING AND WRITING, AND PROVIDE FOR HIS WAGES IN SUCH MANNER AS THE TOWN MIGHT DETERMINE; AND

2. THAT EVERY TOWN HAVING ONE HUNDRED HOUSEHOLDERS MUST PROVIDE A (LATIN) GRAMMAR SCHOOL TO FIT YOUTHS FOR THE UNIVERSITY, UNDER A PENALTY OF FIVE POUNDS FOR FAILURE TO DO SO.¹

¹ELLWOOD P. CUBBERLEY, PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES. (BOSTON, MASS: HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO., 1934), p. 18.

SINCE THESE DEVELOPMENTS, THE COLONIAL BOARD OF EDUCATION PASSED THROUGH THREE NATURAL DEVELOPMENTS.

THE FIRST OF THE PERIODS INTO WHICH THE EVOLUTION OF THE MODERN BOARD OF EDUCATION MAY BE DIVIDED ENCOMPASSED ROUGHLY THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY AND WAS CHARACTERIZED BY THE COMPLETE CONTROL OF SCHOOL AFFAIRS BY CIVIC AUTHORITIES EXERCISED EITHER DIRECTLY BY THE VOTERS AT THEIR TOWN MEETINGS OR THROUGH THEIR ELECTED SELECTMEN.

THE SECOND PERIOD COVERED THE FOLLOWING CENTURY WHEN CONTROL OF THE SCHOOLS GRADUALLY BECAME A DELEGATED FUNCTION OF COMMITTEES, GENERALLY APPOINTED BY THE SELECTMEN OR BY THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES GATHERED IN TOWN MEETING.

FROM REGULATION BY COMMITTEES TO CONTROL BY A SEPARATE BODY OF OFFICIALS RESPONSIBLE NOT TO THE CIVIC AUTHORITIES BUT TO THE PEOPLE WHO ELECTED THEM TO OFFICE WAS A NATURAL STEP. THIS PERIOD BEGAN WITH THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND CONTINUES ON TODAY.²

THEREFORE, AS EARLY AS 1826,³ A MASSACHUSETTS LAW REQUIRED EACH TOWN TO ESTABLISH AN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL COMMITTEE WHICH IS THE COLONIAL BEGINNING OF THE INDEPENDENT BOARD OF EDUCATION.

IT WAS THROUGH THE ENGLISH SETTLERS WHO SETTLED IN THE BOSTON AND PLYMOUTH COLONIES OF MASSACHUSETTS

²L. E. LEIPOLD, "THE COLONIAL BEGINNINGS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, VOLUME 110, No. 5 (MAY, 1945), P. 26.

³LLOYD W. ASHBY, THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER. (DANVILLE, ILL: THE INTERSTATE PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS, INC., 1968), P. 12.

THAT SCHOOL ORGANIZATION IN THE FORM OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS AS UNITS OF SCHOOL GOVERNMENT UNDER THE CIVIL AND NOT THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITIES EMERGED. THIS SYSTEM OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION WAS LATER ADOPTED AND ADAPTED IN OTHER PARTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND EVENTUALLY IN CANADA.

WHEN ONTARIO, QUEBEC, NOVA SCOTIA, AND NEW BRUNSWICK AGREED TO ENTER INTO A CANADIAN UNION IN 1867, THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT, CANADA'S WRITTEN CONSTITUTION, MADE THE PROVISION OF EDUCATION A PROVINCIAL RESPONSIBILITY. SECTION 93 OF THE ACT STATES:

THE PROVINCE IS GIVEN EXCLUSIVE POWER TO MAKE LAWS IN RELATION TO EDUCATION PROVIDED IT RESPECTS ANY RIGHT OR PRIVILEGE WHICH ANYONE HAS BY LAW IN THE PROVINCE AT THE TIME OF UNION, AND PROVIDED THAT THE PROTESTANT OR ROMAN CATHOLIC MINORITY HAS AN APPEAL TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL-IN-COUNCIL FROM ANY ACT OR DECISION OF ANY PROVINCIAL AUTHORITY AFFECTING SUCH RIGHTS OR PRIVILEGES WHICH MAY EXIST OR BE LATER ESTABLISHED IN THE PROVINCE.⁴

THUS, IT IS EVIDENT THAT THE CENTRAL (DOMINION) GOVERNMENT DELEGATED TO THE PROVINCES THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATION AND THIS DELEGATED RESPONSIBILITY HAS RESULTED IN DIFFERENT ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, FROM PROVINCE TO PROVINCE. PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURES IN TURN

⁴R. MACGREGOR DAWSON, DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT IN CANADA. (TORONTO, ONT: UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS, 1963), P. 27.

CREATED THE BOARD OF EDUCATION AS A GOVERNMENTAL BRANCH CHARGED WITH THE DUTY OF PROVIDING AT THE LOCAL LEVEL A SYSTEM OF PUBLIC EDUCATION. AS GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES, SCHOOL BOARDS HAVE HAD CERTAIN OF THEIR DUTIES AND POWERS SPECIFICALLY DEFINED.

ALBERTA LED CANADA IN THE INITIATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF LARGER RURAL UNITS OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION. BEGINNING WITH CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICTS, SUCH AS CHINOOK IN SOUTHEASTERN ALBERTA, AND THE RURAL HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AS AT TWO HILLS, ALBERTA, LARGER SCHOOL ORGANIZATION UNITS WERE MET WITH LIMITED SUCCESS. WITH THE DISCOVERY OF GAS AND OIL RESOURCES IN TURNER VALLEY IN THE LATTER 1930'S AND ITS ACCOMPANYING INFLUX OF POPULATION, AND WITH THE PROBLEMS OF THE DROUGHT-STRICKEN BERRY CREEK AREA, SOUTHEAST OF HANNA, THE GOVERNMENT OF ALBERTA WAS FORCED TO EXPERIMENT WITH A NEW AND LARGER ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT.

WITH THE DEFEAT OF THE UNITED FARMERS OF ALBERTA GOVERNMENT, THE NEWLY-ELECTED SOCIAL CREDIT GOVERNMENT IN 1936 RAPIDLY PLANNED AND ENACTED NEW LEGISLATION WHICH PROVIDED FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF LARGER ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS WHICH WERE CALLED SCHOOL DIVISIONS. THE SCHOOL DIVISIONS COMPRISED ABOUT FIFTY TO SIXTY OR MORE SMALL

RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS. THE ADVANTAGES CLAIMED FOR SCHOOL DIVISIONS INCLUDED:

1. EQUALIZATION OF TAXATION WITHIN THE DISTRICT
2. HIGHER CALIBRE OF DIVISIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS
3. A MORE BUSINESS-LIKE ADMINISTRATION AND GREATER ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY IN ADMINISTRATION
4. IMPROVEMENT IN FACILITIES AND SERVICES
5. INCREASED SUPERVISION THROUGH THE ENGAGEMENT OF MORE SUPERINTENDENTS
6. IMPROVEMENT IN THE PROVISION OF HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUCTION
7. INCREASED LENGTH OF SCHOOL YEAR AND IMPROVED ATTENDANCE
8. IMPROVEMENT IN THE TEACHERS' POSITION AND EFFECTIVE PLACEMENT OF TEACHERS.⁵

WITHIN TWO OR THREE YEARS, JONASON⁶ SAID THAT MORE THAN EIGHTY PER CENT OF ALL ALBERTA SCHOOL DISTRICTS WERE INCLUDED WITHIN THE DIVISIONS. THIRTY-ONE SCHOOL DIVISIONS IN ALBERTA IN 1969⁷ CONTINUED TO OPERATE AS THE LARGER ADMINISTRATIVE SCHOOL UNITS. OTHER LARGER ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS IN THE PROVINCE CONVERTED TO ANOTHER TYPE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION, THE COUNTY.

⁵ALBERTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, AFTER THREE YEARS SCHOOL DIVISIONS IN ALBERTA, (EDMONTON, ALTA: KING'S PRINTER, 1940), PP. 7-25.

⁶JONAS CHRISTIAN JONASON, THE LARGE UNITS OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IN ALBERTA. (UNPUBLISHED DOCTORAL THESIS, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, 1951), PP. 74-76.

⁷CANADIAN ALMANAC AND DIRECTORY FOR 1969. (TORONTO, ONT: COPP CLARK PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1969), P. 684.

THE SMALL SCHOOL DISTRICT WAS NOT THE ONLY LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY TO EXPERIENCE ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS; THE SMALL MUNICIPAL DISTRICT ENCOUNTERED SIMILAR CONDITIONS. BECAUSE OF FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES WHICH DEVELOPED AS A RESULT OF INEFFECTIVENESS AND INEFFICIENCY, MANY OF THE SMALL MUNICIPAL DISTRICTS WERE DISSOLVED AND THEIR ADMINISTRATION WAS TAKEN OVER BY THE ALBERTA DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS. CONSEQUENTLY, SEVERAL SMALL MUNICIPAL UNITS WERE COMBINED TO FORM LARGER MUNICIPAL DISTRICTS. THE NEXT DEVELOPMENT, REFERRED TO BY ITS PROponents AS 'THE FINAL LOGICAL STEP IN THE EVALUATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ALBERTA',⁸ WAS THE AMALGAMATION OF SCHOOL DIVISIONS AND LARGE MUNICIPAL DISTRICTS TO FORM AN ALL-PURPOSE FORM OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT WHERE THE ELECTED COUNTY COUNCIL, THROUGH ITS RESPECTIVE COMMITTEES, GOVERNED BOTH MUNICIPAL AND SCHOOL AFFAIRS. THE COUNTY ACT OF 1950 WHICH MADE POSSIBLE THE AMALGAMATION OF MUNICIPAL AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS CONTINUED TO DEVELOP UNTIL THE PRESENT TIME WHEN THERE ARE THIRTY COUNTIES⁹ IN THE

⁸ALBERTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, AFTER TEN YEARS THE ALBERTA COUNTY SYSTEM. (EDMONTON; ALTA: 1961), p. 5.

⁹CANADIAN ALMANAC AND DIRECTORY FOR 1969, LOC. CIT.

PROVINCE OF ALBERTA.

THE QUESTION OF WHETHER SCHOOL DIVISIONS HAD THE LEGAL RIGHT TO REQUISITION MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES CAUSED THE CONTROVERSY WHICH LED TO THE EVOLUTION OF ALBERTA'S COUNTY SYSTEM. MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS, THE COLLECTING AUTHORITIES AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, HAD LITTLE RECOURSE BUT TO LEVY AND COLLECT THE TAX FOR USE BY SCHOOL AUTHORITIES. ADMINISTRATORS IN MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT ARGUED THAT SINCE THEY WERE THE COLLECTING AUTHORITIES, THEY SHOULD HAVE SOME CONTROL OVER THE SCHOOL BOARD'S EXPENDITURES. THE STRAINED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MUNICIPAL AND EDUCATIONAL AUTHORITIES IS EVIDENCED FROM THE FOLLOWING QUOTATION.

WITH EDUCATIONAL COSTS RISING SHARPLY AND REQUISITIONS ALSO RISING, MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OPENLY ACCUSED SCHOOL BOARDS OF EXTRAVAGANCE, IRRESPONSIBILITY, AND BUILDING UP RESERVES, EVEN AT TIMES WHEN TAXING AUTHORITIES WERE HARD-PRESSED FOR CASH.¹⁰

OPPONENTS OF THE ALBERTA COUNTY SYSTEM VIEWED THE ALL-PURPOSE FORM OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AS AN EDUCATIONAL REGRESSION.

THEY ARGUED THAT SCHOOL AFFAIRS DETERIORATE IN FAVOUR OF ROADS, SIDEWALKS, AND OTHER PUBLIC SERVICES.¹¹

¹⁰GOVERNMENT OF ALBERTA, 1961, OP.CIT., P. 7.

¹¹IBID, P. 5.

PROPOSERS OF THIS SYSTEM CONTENDED THAT THE COUNTY SYSTEM ECONOMIZED ADMINISTRATION, RESOLVED THE REQUISITION CONTROVERSY, AND ESTABLISHED MORE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT OVER-ALL MUNICIPAL AND SCHOOL PLANNING.

THE EVOLUTION OF ALBERTA SCHOOL UNITS HAS DEVELOPED TO THE POINT THAT IN 1969 SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS REPRESENTED THIRTY COUNTY SCHOOL COMMITTEES, THIRTY-ONE DIVISIONAL BOARDS, FIFTY-FOUR PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARDS CONSISTING OF NINE CITY, ELEVEN TOWN, TWO VILLAGE, TWENTY-EIGHT RURAL, AND FOUR CONSOLIDATED UNITS,¹² AND NINETY-SEVEN SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARDS CONSISTING OF TEN CITY, THIRTY-THREE TOWN, SIX VILLAGE, AND FORTY-EIGHT RURAL UNITS.¹³

PURPOSES OF SCHOOL BOARDS

UNDER PART VI, POWERS AND DUTIES OF BOARDS OF TRUSTEES AND THEIR OFFICERS, SECTION 173 OF THE REVISED SCHOOL ACT OF ALBERTA, 1955, THE PURPOSE OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION WAS STATED AS "THE BOARD OF A NON-DIVISIONAL DISTRICT OR OF A DIVISION SHALL ADMINISTER THE DIVISION OR

¹²CANADIAN ALMANAC AND DIRECTORY FOR 1969,
LOC. CIT.

¹³IBID.

DISTRICT".¹⁴ THIS SECTION OF THE ACT REFERS TO THE MANDATORY AND DISCRETIONARY POWERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION. THESE MANDATORY AND DISCRETIONARY RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD ILLUSTRATE THE DUAL ROLE OF SCHOOL BOARDS. H. T. SPARBY INTERPRETS THIS DUAL ROLE OF BOARDS AS:

ON THE ONE HAND, IT IS EXPECTED TO CO-OPERATE WITH THE PROVINCIAL AUTHORITY IN MAINTAINING THE PROVINCE-WIDE MINIMUM. IN THIS ROLE IT SERVES AS AN EXECUTIVE ARM OF THE PROVINCIAL AUTHORITY. ON THE OTHER HAND, IT IS EXPECTED TO PROVIDE THE LEVEL OF SERVICE DESIRED BY ITS CONSTITUENCY. IN THIS ROLE, IT SERVES AS A FORM OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.¹⁵

Z. S. PHIMISTER SEES THIS DUAL ROLE OF BOARDS AS:

PERHAPS THE MAIN PURPOSE OF THE BOARDS REMAINS UNCHANGED, I.E., TO STAND AS AN INTERMEDIARY BETWEEN THE PEOPLE AND THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY AS THE MEANS OF PROVIDING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AS SEEM TO BE REQUIRED BY THE CITIZENS SERVED BY THE SCHOOL BOARD.¹⁶

¹⁴DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, THE SCHOOL ACT. (REVISED STATUTES OF ALBERTA, 1955) CHAPTER 297, SECTION 173(1), P. 56.

¹⁵H. T. SPARBY, "SCHOOL BOARD ORGANIZATION", THE SCHOOL BOARD, PROJECTS IN CANADIAN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION. (UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA: DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, 1961), P. 33.

¹⁶Z. S. PHIMISTER, "THE FUNCTION OF THE SCHOOL BOARD", THE SCHOOL BOARD, PROJECTS IN CANADIAN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION. (UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA: DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, 1961), P. 5.

STATUTE LAW (THE EDUCATION ACT, THE SCHOOL ACT, THE GRANTS ACT, ETC.) DISTRIBUTED THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EDUCATION TO TWO AUTHORITIES: (1) THE PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (CENTRAL AUTHORITY), AND (2) THE SCHOOL BOARDS (LOCAL AUTHORITY). AS A RESULT OF THIS JOINT RESPONSIBILITY, SCHOOL BOARD CRITICS CONTEND THAT BOARDS OF EDUCATION DO NOT EXERCISE THEIR AUTHORITY ENOUGH SINCE THEY ARE TOO OFTEN CONTENT TO LOOK TO THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY FOR INITIATIVE AND GUIDANCE. NEVERTHELESS, IT IS GENERALLY AGREED THAT THE GENERAL AIM OF BOARDS OF EDUCATION THROUGH THE TWO AUTHORITIES IS TO MEET NOT ONLY THE LOCAL NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS BUT ALSO THE SOCIAL NEEDS OF A NATIONAL CHARACTER.

THE PROBLEM

EVERY YEAR, A NUMBER OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO SERVE THE 30 COUNTIES, 31 DIVISIONS, 54 PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARDS, AND 97 SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARDS IN ALBERTA COMPLETE THEIR SERVICE ON LOCAL BOARDS OF EDUCATION AND JOIN THE RANKS OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS. THESE INDIVIDUALS WHO, PROBABLY LIKE THEIR AMERICAN COUNTERPARTS, MAY HAVE HELD POSITIONS FROM LESS THAN A YEAR TO MORE THAN TWENTY-FIVE YEARS HAVE SERVED AN AVERAGE OF FOUR TO

SIX YEARS.^{17, 18}

AFTER RETIREMENT FROM THE SCHOOL BOARD, WHAT HAPPENS TO THESE PEOPLE WHO HAVE HAD SUCH CLOSE ASSOCIATION WITH THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF A COMMUNITY? DO THEY TURN THEIR ATTENTION TO OTHER SOCIETAL AFFAIRS? BECAUSE OF THEIR EXPERIENCE ON THE SCHOOL BOARDS, ARE THEY SOUGHT OUT FOR ADVICE AND COUNSEL ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS BY BOTH THOSE WITHIN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM AND THOSE OUTSIDE IT? WHAT ARE THE FACTORS WHICH MIGHT CORRELATE WITH THE EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS? THESE ARE THE QUESTIONS WHICH PROMPTED THIS SURVEY STUDY.

PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SCHOOL BOARD STUDY WAS TO EXAMINE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER ROLES IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES ONCE THEY HAVE COMPLETED THEIR SERVICE ON THE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS. IN THE PAST, RESEARCHERS HAVE STUDIED THE REASONS FOR WHICH PEOPLE SEEK ELECTION OR APPOINTMENT TO SCHOOL BOARDS, THE

¹⁷MAURICE E. STAPLEY, SCHOOL BOARD STUDIES. (CHICAGO, ILL: MIDWESTERN ADMINISTRATION CENTRE, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 1957), P. 25.

¹⁸ALPHEUS L. WHITE, LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS: ORGANIZATION AND PRACTICES. (WASHINGTON: UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, 1962), P. 32.

SOCIAL COMPOSITIONS OF BOARDS OF EDUCATION, AND THE NATURE OF THE BOARD ROLE. HOWEVER, IN ORDER TO PROVIDE A COMPLETE PICTURE OF THE CAREER PATTERN OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, INFORMATION ABOUT THEIR ACTIVITIES IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS AFTER THEY LEAVE THE BOARD MUST ALSO BE ADDED TO THE AVAILABLE BODY OF KNOWLEDGE.

THUS, THIS RESEARCH WAS AN ATTEMPT TO PROVIDE THAT KNOWLEDGE. THE PROBLEM DIVIDED ITSELF INTO A TWO-FOLD STUDY BASED ON THE QUESTIONS:

(1) TO WHAT EXTENT DO FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPATE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS WITHIN THEIR COMMUNITIES?

(2) ARE THERE CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF AN INDIVIDUAL, OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM, OR OF THE COMMUNITY, THAT RELATE TO THE DEGREE OF EDUCATIONAL PARTICIPATION BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS?

IT WAS HOPED THAT THE STUDY WOULD ILLUSTRATE THE ROLES FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TAKE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES AFTER THEY LEAVE THE BOARD. SUCH FINDINGS MIGHT BE OF VALUE IN INVOLVING RESEARCH PERSONS OR THE LAY PUBLIC IN SCHOOL AFFAIRS, POSSIBLY BY USING FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TO ASSIST IN BRIDGING THE COMMUNICATION GAP THAT SEEMS TO EXIST BETWEEN THE

SCHOOLS AND THE PUBLIC.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

SCHOOL BOARD: FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS RESEARCH THE TERM REFERS TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, ELECTED OR APPOINTED, WHICH HAS BEEN CHARGED WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY OF ADMINISTERING THE SCHOOLS WITHIN ITS TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION. IT INCLUDES BOARD OF TRUSTEES, BOARD OF EDUCATION, COUNTY EDUCATION COMMITTEE, PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARD, SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARD, CONSOLIDATION BOARD, HIGH SCHOOL BOARD, REGIONAL BOARD, ETC.

SCHOOL DISTRICT: AS USED IN THIS STUDY, THE TERM REFERS TO THE TERRITORIAL OR GEOGRAPHIC AREA WITHIN WHICH THE BOARD OF EDUCATION EXERCISES ITS AUTHORITY. THE TERM INCLUDES THE CONSOLIDATION UNITS, THE SCHOOL DIVISIONS, THE REGIONAL DISTRICTS, AND RURAL "FOUR-BY-FOUR" AREAS. IN SHORT, THE TERM INCLUDES ANY AREA SET ASIDE FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES OF ANY KIND.

PUBLIC SCHOOL: THIS TERM IS USED TO REFER TO A SCHOOL SUPPORTED BY PUBLIC TAXATION.

TRUSTEE: TRUSTEE IN THIS STUDY MEANS A MEMBER OF A SCHOOL BOARD.

FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS: THIS REFERS TO TRUSTEES WHO HAVE SERVED ON A SCHOOL BOARD DURING THE

PAST TEN YEARS AND WHO, AS OF APRIL 1, 1968, WERE NO
LONGER ACTIVE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

SINCE GEORGE COUNTS¹⁹ COMPLETED HIS STUDY OF THE SOCIAL COMPOSITION OF SCHOOL BOARDS IN 1927, MUCH ATTENTION HAS BEEN GIVEN TO VARIOUS ASPECTS OF SCHOOL BOARDS BY EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHERS. FOR THE FIRST THIRTY YEARS, MANY OF THE STUDIES MERELY REPLICATED COUNTS' SOCIAL STATUS INVESTIGATION. IN 1955, W. W. CHARTERS, JR.,²⁰ CALLED FOR A "MORATORIUM" ON THIS TYPE OF SCHOOL BOARD RESEARCH SINCE BY THIS TIME THE GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THOSE WHO MADE UP THE SCHOOL BOARDS IN THE UNITED STATES WERE WELL DEFINED.

GARBER AND YEAGER, REFLECTING THE MAJOR LAY AUTHORITY IN EDUCATION IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, ILLUSTRATE THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY.

¹⁹GEORGE S. COUNTS, THE SOCIAL COMPOSITION OF BOARDS OF EDUCATION. (CHICAGO, ILL: UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, 1927.

²⁰W. W. CHARTERS, JR., "BEYOND THE SURVEY IN SCHOOL BOARD RESEARCH", EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, 1955, VOLUME 41, PP. 449-452.

EVEN THOUGH THIS REFLECTION WAS FOCUSED ON THE SCHOOLS OF PENNSYLVANIA, ITS PRINCIPLES MAY HOLD TRUE TO THE ALBERTA SCENE AS WELL.

1. THE SCHOOL DISTRICT IS AN ARM OF THE STATE. IT IS, IN OTHER WORDS, THE STATE'S AGENCY. FROM THIS IT FOLLOWS THAT IT IS NOT AN AGENCY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT, AS IS A CITY, VILLAGE, OR BOROUGH. BEING A STATE AGENCY, IT IS ABSOLUTELY FREE AND INDEPENDENT FROM ANY LOCAL MUNICIPALITY CORPORATION WITH WHICH ITS BOUNDARIES MAY BE COTERMINOUS, UNLESS THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, THE OPERATIONAL UNIT OF THE STATE, HAS SEEN FIT TO DELEGATE TO SUCH AGENCIES CERTAIN RESPONSIBILITIES OVER SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

2. SCHOOL OFFICERS ARE STATE OFFICERS. THIS AGAIN FOLLOWS FROM THE FACT THAT EDUCATION IS A STATE FUNCTION. IN ESSENCE, THIS MEANS THAT SCHOOL OFFICERS HAVE THE SAME LEGAL STATUS AS THOSE STATE OFFICERS WHO OPERATE AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.

3. SCHOOL MONEY IS STATE MONEY AND NOT LOCAL MONEY. THIS MEANS THAT SCHOOL MONEY ACTUALLY BELONGS TO THE STATE AND IS HANDLED BY THE SCHOOL BOARD AS TRUSTEE FOR THE STATE.

4. SCHOOL PROPERTY IS STATE PROPERTY. FROM THIS IT FOLLOWS THAT SCHOOL BUILDINGS AND SCHOOL LANDS ARE NOT THE PROPERTY OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY EVEN THOUGH THE MONEY TO PAY FOR THEM ALL CAME FROM TAXES LEVIED AND COLLECTED LOCALLY. THE BUILDINGS BELONG TO THE STATE AND THE STATE IS COMPLETELY FREE TO CONTROL THEIR USE AND EVEN TO DISPOSE OF THEM, AS IT SEES FIT.

5. TEACHERS ARE STATE EMPLOYEES. THEY ARE NOT EMPLOYEES OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY, AND THEIR STATUS IS FIXED OR DETERMINED BY STATUTE. THEY OCCUPY THE SAME STATUS AS THOSE HIRED BY THE STATE

TO PERFORM DUTIES WITHIN THE STATE CAPITAL. LOCAL AGENCIES HAVE NO CONTROL OVER THEM.²¹

WRITERS ON SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION GENERALLY AGREE THAT THE PRIMARY FUNCTION OF A SCHOOL BOARD IS THAT OF POLICY-FORMATION. TUTTLE SAYS, FOR EXAMPLE, "...THE FUNCTION OF A SCHOOL BOARD IS TO ESTABLISH POLICIES FOR THE OPERATION OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM..."²² WHILE E. L. CUBBERLY REFLECTS:

THE BOARD'S WORK, AS THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PEOPLE, IS TO SIT IN JUDGEMENT ON PROPOSALS, TO DETERMINE THE GENERAL POLICY OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM, AND TO SEE THAT THE POLICIES DECIDED UPON ARE CARRIED OUT BY THE SUPERINTENDENT AND HIS STAFF.²³

BECAUSE OF THE GENERAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE DECISION-MAKING THEORY OF WRITERS SUCH AS BRICKELL, THE SELECTION OF A CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR OF A SCHOOL DISTRICT IS GENERALLY REFERRED TO AS THE MOST IMPORTANT TASK THAT A SCHOOL BOARD FACES. THIS SELECTION PROCESS VARIES FROM ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT TO ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT AND HAS

²¹LEE O. GARBER AND WILLIAM A. YEAGER, LEGAL POWERS AND DUTIES OF PENNSYLVANIA BOARDS OF SCHOOL DIRECTORS. (LANCASTER, PA: BUSINESS PRESS INC., 1959), p. 10.

²²E. M. TUTTLE, SCHOOL BOARD LEADERSHIP IN AMERICA. (DANVILLE, ILL: INTERSTATE PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS, 1958), p. 37.

²³E. P. CUBBERLY, PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION. (NEW YORK: HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO., 1922), p. 206.

BEEN THE TOPIC OF STUDY.^{24, 25, 26}

IN THE SCHOOL BOARD LITERATURE, ONE ALSO FINDS STUDIES WHICH HAVE BEEN DEVOTED TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SCHOOL BOARD AND THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT.²⁷ McCARTY OUTLINES THREE INGREDIENTS FOR IMPROVED SUPERINTENDENT-BOARD RELATIONSHIPS: (1) DEFINITION OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE DUTIES, (2) PURPOSE-DEFINING ACTIVITY, AND (3) DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITY BETWEEN BOARD AND ADMINISTRATOR.²⁸

AS A RESULT OF SUCH FINDINGS AND WRITINGS, BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE ROLES OF THE BOARD MEMBERS AND SUPERINTENDENTS HAS DEVELOPED.

²⁴H. M. BRICKELL, "FORMULATION OF SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES", THE SCHOOL BOARD. (BANFF REGIONAL CONFERENCE, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, EDMONTON, 1951), P. 22.

²⁵THOMAS R. BOWMAN, "SELECTING THE SUPERINTENDENT", ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTEBOOK, 4, FEBRUARY, 1956, PP. 1-4.

²⁶DOYLE M. BORTNER, "SELECTING A SUPERINTENDENT", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, 140, JUNE, 1960, PP. 17-18.

²⁷NEAL GROSS, "EASING STRAINS AND TENSIONS BETWEEN SUPERINTENDENTS AND BOARD MEMBERS", NATION'S SCHOOLS. OCTOBER, 1955.

²⁸DONALD J. McCARTY, "ON BETTER BOARD-SUPERINTENDENT RELATIONS", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, JULY, 1960, P. 8.

WHY PEOPLE SEEK MEMBERSHIP ON LOCAL SCHOOL
BOARDS HAS ALSO BEEN STUDIED,²⁹ AS WELL AS PROCEDURES
FOR RECRUITING AND SELECTING SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS.³⁰
AS A RESULT OF SUCH FINDINGS, WM. C. BRUCE OUTLINED THE
PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND ATTITUDES WHICH EVERY SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBER SHOULD BRING TO EVERY BOARD AND COMMITTEE
MEETING. BRUCE CITES THESE AS:

1. AN ATTITUDE OF RESPECT AND OPENMINDEDNESS
TO OTHERS.
2. AN ATTITUDE OF FLEXIBILITY AND PERMISSIVE
INTERACTION.
3. AN AWARENESS OF COMMUNICATION BARRIERS AND
A DESIRE TO OVERCOME THEM.
4. AN AWARENESS OF THE NEED FOR UNDERSTANDING
GROUP PROCESS.
5. AN ABILITY AND DESIRE TO SPEAK CLEARLY AND
TO THE POINT.
6. AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NEED FOR ATTENTIVE
LISTENING.
7. AN ABILITY TO THINK LOGICALLY AND ANALYTICALLY.
8. A DESIRE TO CO-OPERATE AND CONCILIATE TOWARD
REACHING GOALS.³¹

²⁹DONALD J. McCARTY, "MOTIVES FOR SEEKING
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERSHIP". (UNPUBLISHED DOCTORAL THESIS,
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, 1959.)

³⁰PETER BINZEN, "HOW TO PICK A SCHOOL BOARD",
SATURDAY REVIEW, 48, APRIL 17, 1965. PP. 72-84.

³¹WM. C. BRUCE, "PERSONAL QUALITIES OF SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL.
VOLUME 150, No. 3, MARCH, 1965, P. 72.

BARNHART INVESTIGATED THE BEHAVIOR OF BOARD MEMBERS WHEN FACED WITH SPECIFIC INCIDENTS. ³²

REILLY SAYS THAT SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ARE GENERALLY NOT EXPERTS ON EDUCATION BUT THEY ARE PARENTS OF CHILDREN IN ONE OR MORE OF THE LOCAL SCHOOLS AND THAT "A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER IS NOT A 'VOICE' OR SPOKESMAN FOR ANY PARTICULAR GROUP BUT RATHER HE IS ELECTED BY ALL THE TAXPAYERS AND IS CHARGED WITH MAKING THE WISEST DECISION BASED ON HIS OWN STUDY OF ALL THE FACTS. ONCE HE IS ELECTED, HE IS NO LONGER A SOUNDING BOARD FOR ANY PARTICULAR GROUP OR AREA". ³³

CAMPBELL, DISCUSSING THE DIFFICULTY OF ADMINISTRATION AT A LONG DISTANCE FROM THE LOCAL COMMUNITY, CONTENDS THAT BUREAUCRACIES BECOME INEFFICIENT AND THAT CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS OF SCHOOLS WHO MUST CONFORM TO ORDERS OF GROUPS THAT ARE SEATED AT A DISTANCE FROM THE LOCAL COMMUNITY BECAME ESPECIALLY CONSERVATIVE. ³⁴

³²RICHARD EDWIN BARNHART, "THE CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERSHIP ON AN ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL INCIDENTS" (UNPUBLISHED DOCTORAL THESIS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, 1952.)

³³DESMOND M. C. REILLY, "WHY BE A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, VOLUME 150, No. 5, (MAY, 1965), P. 11.

³⁴WILLIAM C. BRUCE, "THE VALUE OF LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, VOLUME 150, No. 1, (JANUARY, 1965), P. 40.

KRATZMAN, STUDYING THE PRIME FUNCTION OF SCHOOL BOARDS, CLAIMS THAT MAKING DECISIONS IS THEIR PRIME INTEREST. HE CLAIMS:

IF ONE MADE AN EFFORT TO DETERMINE THE ONE THING A BOARD OF TRUSTEES DID, THE ANSWER WOULD, IN ALL PROBABILITY, BE THAT IT MAKES DECISIONS. IT IS, THEREFORE, PROFITABLE TO LOOK AT BOARD MEMBERS COLLECTIVELY AS DECISION-MAKING BODIES, AS WELL AS TO INDICATE THAT THEIR ABILITY TO MAKE WISE DECISIONS IS THE PARAMOUNT INDEX OF THEIR SUCCESS.³⁵

THE EFFECT OF BOARD MEMBERS' TENURE ON THE DECISION PATTERNS OF BOARDS OF EDUCATION HAS NOT BEEN INVESTIGATED IN THOSE TERMS BUT RATHER ON GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS AS SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS. STAPLEY REPORTED THAT A MINIMUM TENURE OF FOUR YEARS IS DESIRABLE, AND THAT EFFECTIVENESS INCREASES FOR THE FIRST SIX YEARS AFTER WHICH TIME NO ADVANCE OR DECLINE IS EVIDENT.³⁶ A SPOKESMAN FOR THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION EXPRESSED TRUSTEE TENURE AS FOLLOWS:

NO AUTHENTIC STANDARD HAS BEEN DEVELOPED AS AN OPTIMUM LENGTH OF SERVICE FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS; THOUGH IT IS GENERALLY AGREED THAT RAPID TURNOVER IN BOARD MEMBERSHIP IS OBJECTIONABLE. THE DATA OF THIS STUDY SUPPORT THAT CONCLUSION IN THAT THE MEDIAN TENURE

³⁵A. KRATZMAN, "BOARD-SUPERINTENDENT RELATIONSHIPS", THE SCHOOL BOARD, ORGANIZING FOR EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION. (UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA: DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, 1965), P. 33, (MIMEOGRAPHED)

³⁶STAPLEY, LOC. CIT.

FOR SUPERIOR BOARDS IS SOMEWHAT LONGER THAN THAT FOR BELOW AVERAGE BOARDS.³⁷

THIS RESEARCH ASSUMES THAT CHANGES HAVE TAKEN PLACE IN THE MAKE-UP OF DECISION PATTERNS IN THE PERIOD 1949-1964; HOWEVER, STUDIES TO SUPPORT OR REFUTE THIS ASSUMPTION WERE NOT FOUND.

WHITE, IN HIS ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL BOARD ORGANIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES, DECIDED TO FIND THE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, "WHO SERVES ON THE BOARD OF EDUCATION?" FOR THIS 1959 SURVEY, INFORMATION RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING FOUR QUESTIONS WAS TABULATED: (1) AMOUNT OF FORMAL EDUCATION, (2) OCCUPATION, (3) SEX, AND (4) LENGTH OF SERVICE OF BOARD MEMBERS. HE REPORTS HIS FINDINGS AS:

CITY BOARD MEMBERS FROM THE STANDPOINT OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT WERE A SELECT GROUP. THREE OUT OF EVERY FOUR CITY BOARD MEMBERS WERE COLLEGE GRADUATES IN CONTRAST TO 1 OUT OF 12 AMONG THE UNITED STATES POPULATION ABOVE 25 YEARS OF AGE AND 1 OUT OF EVERY 2 BOARD MEMBERS IN SYSTEMS WITH 1,200 OR MORE PUPILS.

NINE OUT OF EVERY TEN BOARD MEMBERS CAME FROM THREE OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS: (1) BUSINESS OWNERS, OFFICIALS, AND MANAGERS; (2) PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL SERVICES; AND (3) HOUSEWIVES. APPROXIMATELY ONE-FIFTH OF THE BOARD MEMBERS IN THE LARGE CITIES

³⁷NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, STATUS AND PRACTICES OF BOARDS OF EDUCATION, RESEARCH BULLETIN 24, APRIL, 1946, PP. 49-70.

WERE WOMEN. AS OF 1959, ABOUT HALF OF THE BOARD MEMBERS SERVED FOR TEN OR MORE YEARS.³⁸

AUTHORITIES IN THE FIELD OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION GENERALLY ADVOCATE THAT SCHOOL BOARDS BE RELATIVELY SMALL AND THAT AUTHORITIES RECOMMEND EITHER FIVE-, SEVEN-, OR NINE-MEMBER BOARDS. IN HIS 1959 STUDY IN THE UNITED STATES, WHITE CAME UP WITH THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS:

IN 1959, MORE THAN FOUR-FIFTHS (83.1%) OF THE BOARDS HAD FIVE, SEVEN, OR NINE MEMBERS, AS COMPARED WITH 63.5% IN 1917. ONLY A HANDFUL OF THE BOARDS HAD LESS THAN FIVE MEMBERS IN ANY OF THE REPORTING YEARS.³⁹

IT IS EVIDENT FROM WHITE'S SURVEY OF 1959 THAT THE TREND IN SIZE OF SCHOOL BOARDS IN THE UNITED STATES IS TO THAT OF LARGER BOARDS. RECENT SURVEYS IN ONTARIO REVEAL CONSIDERABLE SUPPORT FOR LARGER DISTRICTS.⁴⁰

SCHOOL BOARD LITERATURE ILLUSTRATES THAT STUDIES HAVE BEEN DONE ON THE CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOL

³⁸ALPHEUS L. WHITE, "AN ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL BOARD ORGANIZATION", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, VOLUME 146, No. 4, (APRIL, 1963), P. 8.

³⁹IBID.

⁴⁰"COUNTY AND DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARDS: THE SCHOOL BOARD SPEAKS OUT...", THE ARGUS, VOLUME 27, No. 1, (JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1968), P. 13.

BOARD MEMBERS^{41, 42} AND THE CONGRUITY AND DIFFERENCES
IN RESPONSES REGARDING EDUCATIONAL MATTERS BETWEEN
BOARD MEMBERS, SUPERINTENDENTS, TEACHERS, AND COMMUNITY
LEADERS.⁴³

NEVERTHELESS, IN RESEARCHING RELATED LITERATURE
NO STUDIES COULD BE FOUND SPECIFICALLY DEVOTED TO FORMER
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS. ONLY OCCASIONAL MENTION WAS MADE
OF THEM IN SCHOOL BOARD STUDIES AND WRITINGS.

THUS, IT IS EVIDENT THAT WHILE MUCH ATTENTION
HAS BEEN FOCUSED ON SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION, STUDIES AND WRITINGS, LITTLE OR NO CONCERN
HAS BEEN GIVEN TO SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THEIR ROLE IN
EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS AFTER THEY HAVE COMPLETED THEIR SER-
VICE ON THE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD.

⁴¹JOHN C. ALMACK, THE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER.
(NEW YORK: MACMILLAN COMPANY, 1927.)

⁴²DENNIS H. COOKE AND CON J. WELCH, "PORTRAIT
OF A GOOD BOARD MEMBER", NATION'S SCHOOLS 27, (FEBRUARY,
1941), PP. 58-61.

⁴³THOMAS R. BOWMAN, "PARTICIPATION OF
SUPERINTENDENTS IN SCHOOL BOARD DECISION-MAKING: DO
SUPERINTENDENTS, BOARD MEMBERS, AND PROFESSORS AGREE?"
ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTEBOOK 11, (JANUARY, 1963), PP. 1-4.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

THIS SURVEY STUDY WAS DESIGNED AND DEVELOPED IN TWO PARTS IN ORDER TO ANSWER THE TWO BASIC QUESTIONS.

1. TO WHAT EXTENT DO FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPATE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS WITHIN THEIR COMMUNITIES, AND

2. ARE THERE CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INDIVIDUAL, OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM, OF THE COMMUNITY, WHICH RELATE TO THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS?

DESIGN OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

THE QUESTIONNAIRE HAD TWO DISTINCT PARTS; ONE PART (QUESTIONS 1-23 INCLUSIVE) OBTAINED PERSONAL AND COMMUNITY INFORMATION ABOUT THE FORMER BOARD MEMBER, HIS SCHOOL DISTRICT, AND HIS COMMUNITY; AND THE OTHER PART (QUESTIONS 24-58 INCLUSIVE) OBTAINED SPECIFIC INFORMATION ON THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE INDIVIDUAL PERCEIVED HIS PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF HIS COMMUNITY DURING THE ONE-YEAR PERIOD FROM APRIL 1967 TO

APRIL 1968. FROM THIS INFORMATION IN RESPONSE TO THESE TWO PARTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE, IT WAS THEN POSSIBLE TO MEASURE THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION BY THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS THAT WERE SAMPLED AND TO IDENTIFY THE VARIABLES WHICH MIGHT BE RELATED TO THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION.

PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES INFORMATION

PART II OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE REQUESTED INFORMATION ON PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES WHICH CAME UNDER FOUR GROUPINGS: (1) INFORMATION-SEEKING ACTIVITIES, (2) ADVICE-GIVING ACTIVITIES, (3) CAMPAIGNING ACTIVITIES, AND (4) DIRECT PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES.

(1) INFORMATION-SEEKING ACTIVITIES INCLUDED THOSE ACTIVITIES IN WHICH THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER SEEKS INFORMATION ABOUT THE SCHOOL SYSTEM FROM PRESENT ADMINISTRATION, BOARD MEMBERS, TEACHERS, AND OTHERS IN THE COMMUNITY.

(2) ADVICE-GIVING ACTIVITIES INCLUDED BOTH SOLICITED AND UNSOLICITED ADVICE GIVEN TO PRESENT SCHOOL STAFF MEMBERS, BOARD MEMBERS, SPECIAL COMMITTEES, AND OTHERS IN THE COMMUNITY.

(3) CAMPAIGNING ACTIVITIES ENCOMPASSED THOSE ACTS IN WHICH THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER ENCOURAGES

PEOPLE TO PARTICIPATE BY VOTING IN SCHOOL ELECTIONS OR RUNNING FOR THE BOARD. ACTIVITIES SUCH AS WRITING A LETTER TO THE NEWS EDITOR OR ISSUING A PRESS RELEASE ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER ARE ALSO IN THIS DIMENSION.

(4) DIRECT PARTICIPATION IS DEFINED AS MAKING A SPECIFIC COMMITMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN AN ACTIVITY WHICH AFFECTS EDUCATION. THIS MIGHT VARY FROM VOTING IN A SCHOOL ELECTION TO SERVING ON A CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE OR A GOVERNING BOARD FOR ANOTHER EDUCATIONAL AGENCY; FOR EXAMPLE, REGIONAL BOARD, JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD, ETC.

IN EACH OF THE FOUR DIMENSIONS, RESPONDENTS RECEIVED A PARTICIPATION SCORE. AN "INFORMATION-SEEKING" SCORE WAS BASED UPON THE RESPONDENT'S RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS "24" THROUGH "34" INCLUSIVE IN THE INSTRUMENT:

24. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY TELEPHONED THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

25. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY TELEPHONED A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

26. HAVE YOU GONE TO THE SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

27. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY GONE TO SEE A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

28. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED A TEACHER IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?
29. HAVE YOU ATTENDED BOARD MEETINGS TO SEEK INFORMATION OR TO OBSERVE?
30. HAVE YOU ATTENDED MEETINGS OF A LAY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (E.G., BUILDING COMMITTEE, ETC.) TO SEEK INFORMATION OR TO OBSERVE?
31. HAVE YOU INFORMALLY SOUGHT INFORMATION OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FROM FRIENDS, RELATIVES, OR BUSINESS ASSOCIATES?
32. HAVE YOU SOUGHT INFORMATION OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS DURING INFORMAL SOCIAL SITUATIONS?
33. HAVE YOU SOUGHT INFORMATION OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FROM A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD DURING INFORMAL SOCIAL SETTINGS?
34. HAVE YOU READ ANY EDUCATIONAL PUBLICATIONS, (E.G., ALBERTA SCHOOL TRUSTEE, A.T.A. MAGAZINE, ETC.)?

QUESTION ITEMS TO MEASURE THE "ADVICE-GIVING"

SCORE INCLUDED THE FOLLOWING FOURTEEN QUESTIONS (35 THROUGH 48):

35. HAVE TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM EVER CONTACTED YOU FOR YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?
36. HAVE BOARD MEMBERS TELEPHONED YOU TO SEEK YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?
37. HAS THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS TELEPHONED YOU TO SEEK YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?
38. HAVE BOARD MEMBERS COME TO SEE YOU SEEKING YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?
39. HAS THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS COME TO SEE YOU SEEKING YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

40. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY TELEPHONED THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS TO GIVE HIM YOUR OPINION OR ADVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

41. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY TELEPHONED A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD TO GIVE THEM YOUR OPINION OR ADVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

42. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY GONE TO THE SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE TO GIVE HIM YOUR OPINION OR ADVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

43. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY GONE TO SEE A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD TO GIVE THEM YOUR OPINION OR ADVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

44. HAVE YOU ATTENDED BOARD MEETINGS IN WHICH YOU EXPRESSED YOUR OPINION OR GAVE ADVICE TO THE BOARD?

45. HAVE YOU ATTENDED A LAY COMMITTEE MEETING (E.G., BUILDING COMMITTEE, ETC.) IN WHICH YOU EXPRESSED AN OPINION OR GAVE ADVICE TO THE COMMITTEE?

46. HAVE FRIENDS, BUSINESS ASSOCIATES, FELLOW WORKERS, OR RELATIVES SOUGHT YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

47. HAVE YOU EXPRESSED AN OPINION OR GIVEN ADVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS DURING AN INFORMAL SITUATION?

48. HAVE YOU EXPRESSED AN OPINION OR GIVEN ADVICE TO A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER DURING AN INFORMAL SITUATION?

SIX QUESTIONS (NUMBERS 49-53 AND NUMBER 58) WERE SELECTED TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT TO WHICH FORMER BOARD MEMBERS MIGHT PARTICIPATE IN "CAMPAIGNING ACTIVITIES" WITHIN THEIR DISTRICTS:

49. HAVE YOU ENCOURAGED ANYONE TO RUN FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD?

50. HAVE YOU ACTIVELY CAMPAIGNED FOR A SCHOOL BOARD CANDIDATE?

51. HAVE YOU WRITTEN A LETTER TO THE EDITOR ON AN EDUCATIONAL ISSUE?

52. HAVE YOU ISSUED A PRESS RELEASE OR BEEN QUOTED IN THE PRESS ON AN EDUCATIONAL ISSUE?

53. HAVE YOU ENCOURAGED ANYONE TO VOTE (FOR OR AGAINST) A SCHOOL CENTRALIZATION ISSUE?

58. HAVE YOU SPOKEN BEFORE ANY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION REGARDING AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

THE FOURTH DIMENSION TO BE TESTED, "DIRECT PARTICIPATION", RELIED ON THREE QUESTIONS (NUMBERS 54-56 INCLUSIVE) RELATING TO ACTUAL SERVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL BOARD OR ADVISORY COMMITTEE, WHILE ONE QUESTION, NUMBER 57, OBTAINED INFORMATION ON ACTIVE SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES:

54. HAVE YOU SERVED AS A MEMBER OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BUILDING COMMITTEE, ETC.)?

55. HAVE YOU SERVED ON ANY EDUCATIONAL BOARDS, E.G., REGIONAL BOARD, JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD, OR BEEN RE-ELECTED TO THE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD? IF YES, WHAT BOARD?

56. HAVE YOU ACTIVELY PARTICIPATED AS A MEMBER OF ANY CITIZENS' COMMITTEE OR ORGANIZATION CONCERNED WITH EDUCATION?

57. DID YOU VOTE IN THE LAST SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION?

SCORING

THE PARTICIPATION SCORE IN EACH DIMENSION WAS DETERMINED BY COUNTING THE NUMBER OF 'FREQUENTLY',

'OCCASIONALLY' OR 'YES' RESPONSES IN EACH DIMENSION. NO DISTINCTION WAS MADE BETWEEN A 'NEVER' RESPONSE AND NO RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION.

IF A RESPONDENT CHECKED FREQUENTLY, HE WAS CREDITED WITH A TWO FOR EACH SUCH RESPONSE; EACH CHECK IN THE OCCASIONALLY COLUMN WAS GIVEN ONE AND EACH RESPONSE IN THE NEVER COLUMN WAS ASSIGNED A ZERO.

THE TOTAL OF EACH DIMENSION WAS DIVIDED BY THE NUMBER OF QUESTIONS IN THAT DIMENSION IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE EQUAL WEIGHTING. THEN A TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORE WAS OBTAINED FROM THE FOUR PARTICIPATION DIMENSIONS FOR EACH RESPONDENT.

THE METHOD USED TO MEASURE PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY WAS DEPENDENT ENTIRELY UPON THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS. IN SOME CASES, THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS MAY HAVE SEEN THEMSELVES AS VERY ACTIVE PARTICIPANTS; WHEREAS, IN REALITY, THEY MAY NOT BE SO INVOLVED AS SOME PERSONS WHO RATED THEMSELVES AS RELATIVELY INACTIVE IN THE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS. FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS STUDY, IT WAS NECESSARY TO ASSUME THAT FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ACCURATELY PERCEIVED THE EXTENT OF THEIR PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT.

TO OBTAIN THE TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORE IN WHICH

EACH DIMENSION WAS EQUALLY WEIGHTED, THE SCORE OF EACH DIMENSION WAS SUMMED AND THE SUM DIVIDED BY THE NUMBER OF QUESTIONS, THUS GIVING EACH DIMENSION A SCORE OF TWO OR LESS. AN INDIVIDUAL'S PARTICIPATION SCORE, THEN, WAS CALCULATED BY SUMMING THE QUOTIENT SCORES OF EACH DIMENSION. THE RANGE OF PARTICIPATION SCORES WAS 2.001 TO 6.441.

THE SURVEY

IDENTIFYING AND CONTACTING THE FORMER BOARD MEMBERS

SUPERINTENDENTS IN ALBERTA'S 30 COUNTIES, 31 SCHOOL DIVISIONS, AND 17 LARGER SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH LOCALLY APPOINTED SUPERINTENDENTS WERE ASKED TO COMPLETE A SEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ALL SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAVE SERVED IN THEIR COMMUNITIES' BOARD OF EDUCATION DURING THE PAST TEN YEARS, AND WHO, AS OF APRIL 1, 1968, WERE NO LONGER ACTIVE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD. THE SUPERINTENDENTS SUBMITTED NAMES OF 420 FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FROM 22 SCHOOL DIVISIONS, 20 COUNTIES, AND 12 LARGER SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH LOCALLY APPOINTED SUPER-

INTENDENTS.

THE SUPERINTENDENTS IN THE COUNTY, SCHOOL DIVISIONS, AND LARGER ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS WITH LOCALLY APPOINTED SUPERINTENDENTS DID NOT ONLY PROVIDE THE NAMES OF FORMER TRUSTEES, BUT THEY ALSO (1) ISSUED THEIR ADDRESS, IF KNOWN, (2) HOW LONG THE FORMER TRUSTEES SERVED ON THE BOARD, AND (3) WHETHER THE FORMER TRUSTEE WAS (A) DECEASED, (B) STILL IN THE DISTRICT, OR (C) WHEREABOUTS OF THE FORMER TRUSTEE UNKNOWN. (SEE PAGES 137-140.) THE LIST OF NAMES AND OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION WAS RETURNED VIA MAIL IN SELF-ADDRESSED AND STAMPED ENVELOPES.

QUESTIONNAIRES WERE MAILED TO ALL THE NAMES SUBMITTED BY THE SUPERINTENDENTS. ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE OF THESE FORMER TRUSTEES RETURNED THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE WHILE THIRTY-EIGHT RETURNED THE QUESTIONNAIRE WITH COMMENTS AS:

(1) "I AM TOO OLD AND ILL TO COMPLETE SUCH A DETAILED QUESTIONNAIRE."

(2) "THE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TOO LONG AND DIFFICULT TO COMPLETE."

(3) "MY HUSBAND/WIFE WHO HAD SERVED ON THE SCHOOL BOARD HAS SINCE PASSED AWAY."

(4) "MY HUSBAND IS IN AN OLD AGE HOME AND HE IS TOO ILL TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE."

A COMPILATION OF THE INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS REVEALED THAT 411 INDIVIDUALS (AN AVERAGE OF 7.4 OR 7 PER ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT) HAD LEFT THE SCHOOL BOARD DURING THE 10-YEAR PERIOD. OF THAT NUMBER, 44 PERSONS WERE NOW REPORTED DECEASED AND 17 INDIVIDUALS WERE REPORTED BY THE SUPERINTENDENTS AS THEIR WHEREABOUTS BEING UNKNOWN. EIGHT INDIVIDUALS RETURNED THEIR QUESTIONNAIRES SIGNIFYING THAT THEY HAD SERVED ON THE MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE OF THE COUNTY AND NOT THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE. IN ADDITION, TWELVE QUESTIONNAIRES WERE RETURNED BY THE POST OFFICE FOR AN UNKNOWN CHANGE OF ADDRESS. THIS LEFT A TOTAL OF 330 FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS STILL RESIDING WITHIN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS. OUT OF THE POSSIBLE 330 QUESTIONNAIRES, 195 WERE RETURNED REPRESENTING 59.09 RETURN. FOR THE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS IN CHAPTER VI, AN ADDITIONAL TWELVE QUESTIONNAIRES HAD TO BE DISCARDED FOR INSUFFICIENT REPORTING.

THESE 195 INDIVIDUALS PROVIDED INFORMATION ABOUT THEMSELVES, THEIR SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND THEIR COMMUNITIES. THE 183 RESPONDENTS INDICATED HOW THEY PERCEIVED THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS

OF THEIR COMMUNITIES DURING THE PAST YEAR, APRIL 1968 TO APRIL 1969.

AFTER THE QUESTIONNAIRE HAD BEEN IN THE HANDS OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AT LEAST THREE WEEKS, A FOLLOW-UP WAS MADE TO EACH INDIVIDUAL WHO HAD NOT YET RETURNED HIS QUESTIONNAIRE. THIS FOLLOW-UP WAS MADE VIA MAIL. (APPENDIX B.) IF THE QUESTIONNAIRE HAD NOT BEEN RECEIVED, OR HAD BEEN MISLAID, A SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE WAS MAILED.

VARIABLES IDENTIFIED AND HYPOTHESES SUGGESTED

AFTER DETERMINING THE PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO RETURNED THEIR QUESTIONNAIRES, THE RESEARCH SOUGHT TO IDENTIFY THE VARIABLES WHICH MIGHT RELATE TO THIS PARTICIPATION.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND EXPERIENCES STUDIED

INCLUDED:

- (1) AGE
- (2) SEX
- (3) EDUCATION
- (4) OCCUPATION
- (5) PARENTAL INTEREST
- (6) YEARS OF BOARD EXPERIENCE
- (7) RECENCY OF BOARD SERVICE

- (8) HOW BOARD MEMBER OBTAINED POSITION
- (9) REASON FOR RESIGNING FROM BOARD
- (10) REASON FOR SEEKING ELECTION ON THE BOARD
- (11) INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS PRIOR TO BOARD SERVICE
- (12) LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN THE COMMUNITY
- (13) PREVIOUS EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE
- (14) WHETHER HE WAS ELECTED OR APPOINTED
- (15) INVOLVEMENT IN OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES SINCE LEAVING BOARD
- (16) MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS.

VARIABLES RELATING TO THE SCHOOL SYSTEM INCLUDED:

- (17) SUPERINTENDENT INCUMBENCY
- (18) TYPE OF BOARD AS TO ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTION
- (19) SERVICE DURING PERIODS OF CONTROVERSY
- (20) EFFORTS BY DISTRICT TO KEEP FORMER BOARD MEMBERS INTERESTED
- (21) SELECTION OF BOARD MEMBERS

COMMUNITY VARIABLES TESTED WERE:

- (22) PERCEPTION OF TYPE OF POWER STRUCTURE IN COMMUNITY
- (23) SIZE OF COMMUNITY

HYPOTHESES

OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION

OCCUPATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP OF THE FORMER BOARD MEMBER ARE IMPORTANT FACTORS WHEN CONSIDERING OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION. IT APPEARS PLAUSIBLE THAT INDIVIDUALS ENGAGED IN WORK WHERE THEY ARE IN DAILY CONTACT WITH THE PUBLIC WOULD HAVE GREATER OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION THAN THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE EMPLOYED IN MORE SOLITARY OCCUPATIONS. FURTHERMORE, ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDE A WIDER OPPORTUNITY TO WORK WITH MANY PEOPLE. THEREFORE, TWO HYPOTHESES ARE PRESENTED:

H₁: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO THE TYPES OF OCCUPATIONAL BACK-GROUNDS.

H₂: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BASED ON THE NUMBER OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH THEY ACTIVELY PARTICIPATED.

THE SIZE AND THE POWER STRUCTURE OF A COMMUNITY CAN ALSO AFFECT THE COMMUNICATION OPPORTUNITIES. A SMALLER COMMUNITY OFTEN PROVIDES MORE OPPORTUNITY FOR A CLOSE ASSOCIATION AMONG ITS RESIDENTS; THUS, ENHANCING OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION. THE MAIN CHARACTERISTIC

OF A PLURALISTIC, POWER-STRUCTURED COMMUNITY IS THAT EVERY EFFORT IS MADE TO ENCOURAGE ITS CITIZENS TO PARTICIPATE IN DECISION-MAKING, WHILE IN A MONOLITHIC, POWER-STRUCTURED COMMUNITY, LITTLE OR NO EFFORT IS MADE TO ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION. BASED ON THIS DICHOTOMY, THE FOLLOWING HYPOTHESES ARE SUGGESTED:

H_3 : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO LIVE IN PLURALISTIC POWER-STRUCTURED COMMUNITIES AND THOSE WHO LIVE IN MONOLITHIC POWER-STRUCTURED ONES.

H_4 : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THE COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BASED ON THE SIZE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT.

WHEN PEOPLE KNOW EACH OTHER AND HAVE WORKED TOGETHER, COMMUNICATION OPPORTUNITIES ARE BETTER. IF THE CURRENT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS OR CURRENT BOARD MEMBER WAS SERVING HIS TERM, THAT INDIVIDUAL IS MORE LIKELY TO INTERACT WITH OTHERS ON THE BOARD ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS THAN IF THERE HAD BEEN A CHANGE OF ADMINISTRATOR OR BOARD MEMBERS. ON THIS ASSUMPTION, THE FOLLOWING HYPOTHESIS IS PROPOSED:

H_5 : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO LIVED IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT HAD NOT CHANGED SUPERINTENDENTS SINCE THE TRUSTEES LEFT THE BOARDS AND THOSE THAT HAD CHANGED SUPERINTENDENTS.

BOARD CHARACTERISTICS

THE TYPE OF BOARD ON WHICH A FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER SERVED MAY HAVE ENCOURAGED OR DISCOURAGED FURTHER PARTICIPATION BY HIM AFTER HIS RETIREMENT. ACCORDING TO DONALD J. McCARTY,⁴⁴ THERE ARE THREE TYPES OF BOARDS: (1) THE "DOMINATED" BOARD,⁴⁵ (2) THE "SPLIT-VOTE" BOARD,⁴⁶ AND (3) THE "RATIONAL" BOARD.⁴⁷ IF A SCHOOL BOARD IS DOMINATED BY ONE INDIVIDUAL, THEN ACTIVE PARTICIPATION ON THE PART OF THE OTHER BOARD MEMBERS IS DISCOURAGED. SCHOOL BOARDS THAT MUST ALWAYS RELY ON THE "SPLIT OR MAJORITY VOTE" OF THE MEMBERSHIP LACK HARMONIOUS WORKING RELATIONSHIPS THAT ARE GENERALLY FOUND ON THE "RATIONAL" TYPE BOARD WHERE DECISIONS ARE BASED UPON THE CONSIDERED OPINIONS OF THE TOTAL BODY WITH THE BOARD GENERALLY IN AGREEMENT ON FINAL DECISIONS. THE "RATIONAL" TYPE OF BOARD SEEMS TO POSSESS A BETTER ATTITUDE TO THE BOARD

⁴⁴DONALD J. McCARTY, "SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERSHIP: WHY CITIZENS SERVE?" ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTEBOOK, VOLUME 8, No. 1, (SEPTEMBER, 1959), P. 4.

⁴⁵POLICIES ADVOCATED PRIMARILY BY ONE STRONG MEMBER WHO THEN CONVINCES OTHER MEMBERS TO SUPPORT HIS POLICY.

⁴⁶POLICIES RESOLVED BY MAJORITY VOTE; THE DECISION GENERALLY BASED ON A SPLIT-DECISION, E.G., 3-2 OR 4-3.

⁴⁷POLICIES EMERGING FROM THE CONSIDERED OPINIONS OF THE TOTAL BODY; THE BOARD GENERALLY IN AGREEMENT ON POLICY DECISIONS.

PROCESS AND MAY ENCOURAGE THE FORMER BOARD MEMBER TO CONTINUE TO PARTICIPATE IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS.

WHENEVER THERE IS A MAJOR CONTROVERSY OVER AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER, MUCH ATTENTION IS GIVEN TO INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBERS. AS A RESULT THEY BECOME BETTER KNOWN AND ARE IDENTIFIED WITH A CAUSE. COMMUNITY ALIGNMENT MAY RESULT IN A DISTRICT WHICH CONTINUES TO SEEK HIS ADVICE AND/OR SUPPORT EVEN AFTER HE HAS COMPLETED HIS BOARD SERVICE.

IN SOME SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AN EFFORT IS MADE TO KEEP FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS INFORMED ABOUT THE AFFAIRS OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT AND TO KEEP THEM INTERESTED IN ITS ACTIVITIES. OTHERS GIVE ALL FORMER BOARD MEMBERS A LIFE-TIME PASS TO ALL SCHOOL ACTIVITIES. FOR PURPOSES OF THIS STUDY, IT IS ASSUMED THAT SUCH EFFORT BY THE DISTRICT WILL RESULT IN MORE PARTICIPATION ON THE PART OF FORMER BOARD MEMBERS.

THE FOLLOWING HYPOTHESES WERE TESTED:

H₆: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BASED ON THE TYPE OF SCHOOL BOARD.

H₇: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO SERVED ON SCHOOL BOARDS DURING A PERIOD OF MAJOR CONTROVERSY AND THOSE WHO SERVED ON BOARDS WHERE THERE WAS NO MAJOR CONTROVERSY.

H₈: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO LIVED IN DISTRICTS WHERE EFFORTS ARE MADE BY THE SCHOOL BOARDS AND THEIR ADMINISTRATORS TO KEEP FORMER BOARD MEMBERS ACTIVE AND INTERESTED IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS AND THOSE WHO LIVE WHERE NO SUCH EFFORTS ARE MADE.

H₉: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BASED ON THE TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT.

INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

THE INDIVIDUAL WHO WAS ACTIVE IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS BEFORE SERVING ON THE SCHOOL BOARD WOULD PROBABLY CONTINUE HIS ACTIVE INTEREST EVEN AFTER LEAVING THE BOARD. HOWEVER, THE INDIVIDUAL WHO BECOMES ACTIVELY INVOLVED WITH ANOTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY AFTER HIS SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE MAY DIRECT HIS FULL ATTENTION TO THE NEW ACTIVITIES OF THAT AGENCY RATHER THAN REMAINING INTERESTED IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS. TWO HYPOTHESES WERE TESTED ON THESE THEORIES:

H₁₀: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BASED ON THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS PRIOR TO THEIR ELECTION OR APPOINTMENT TO SCHOOL BOARDS.

H₁₁: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO DID NOT BECOME INVOLVED IN OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AFTER LEAVING THE SCHOOL BOARD AND THOSE WHO DID BECOME INVOLVED.

FACTORS RELATING TO BOARD SERVICE

THE PRIME REASON THAT AN INDIVIDUAL DECIDES TO SEEK ELECTION FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD IS THAT HIS INTERESTS MAY CORRELATE WITH HIS PARTICIPATION SCORE. IF AN INDIVIDUAL WAS ENCOURAGED BY A GROUP TO SEEK SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION, HE WOULD PROBABLY BE URGED BY THAT GROUP TO USE HIS INFLUENCE ON THEIR BEHALF EVEN AFTER HE HAS LEFT THE BOARD. THIS GROUP MIGHT ALSO CONTINUE TO CONSULT WITH HIM FREQUENTLY FOR HIS ADVICE OR OPINION. THEREFORE, IT WAS HYPOTHESIZED:

H₁₂: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BASED ON THE METHOD USED TO SELECT SCHOOL BOARD CANDIDATES.

H₁₃: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN GROUPED ACCORDING TO REASONS FOR RUNNING FOR ELECTION FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD.

FAILURE TO STAND FOR RE-ELECTION, DEFEAT, OR RESIGNATION WERE THE MOST COMMON WAYS IN WHICH RESPONDENTS LEFT THE SCHOOL BOARD. THE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER WHO HAS SERVED THE SCHOOL DISTRICT AND WHO ELECTS NOT TO SEEK RE-ELECTION MAY BE IN A BETTER POSITION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF HIS COMMUNITY AFTER RETIREMENT THAN THE INDIVIDUAL WHO SUFFERS DEFEAT. THROUGH DEFEAT, THE FORMER BOARD MEMBER MAY LOSE MUCH OF HIS POSSIBILITY

FOR INFLUENCE. THE RESULTING HYPOTHESIS WHICH WAS TESTED WAS:

H₁₄: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN GROUPED ACCORDING TO THE METHOD OF RETIREMENT.

THERE IS A POSSIBILITY THAT PARTICIPATION SCORES OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS MAY BE RELATED TO TIME. IT WOULD SEEM PROBABLE THAT THE LONGER THE RETIREMENT PERIOD, THE LESS THE INDIVIDUAL MIGHT PARTICIPATE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF HIS COMMUNITY. CONVERSELY, THE INDIVIDUAL WHO HAS MORE RECENTLY LEFT THE SCHOOL BOARD WOULD STILL FEEL A CLOSE ATTACHMENT TO THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. THE LENGTH OF SERVICE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD MAY ALSO BE RELATED TO A FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER'S PARTICIPATION AND HIS IMAGE AS AN EDUCATIONAL LEADER. SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAVE A RECORD OF LENGTHY BOARD SERVICE OFTEN BECOME SO INVOLVED IN SCHOOL AFFAIRS THAT THEY ARE IDENTIFIED WITH EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES WITHIN THEIR COMMUNITIES EVEN AFTER THEY COMPLETE THEIR SERVICE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD. THE TWO HYPOTHESES RELATING TO TIME WHICH WERE TESTED WERE:

H₁₅: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN CATEGORIZED BY THE TIME SERVED ON THE SCHOOL BOARDS.

H₁₆: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO RECENCY OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE.

PERSONAL FACTORS

FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAVE CHILDREN IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL HAVE A VERY PERSONAL REASON TO BE VITALLY CONCERNED WITH THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IN THEIR COMMUNITY, AND SINCE THESE INDIVIDUALS WILL GENERALLY BE YOUNGER THAN THE AVERAGE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, TWO HYPOTHESES WERE TESTED:

H₁₇: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN GROUPED BY AGE.

H₁₈: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO STILL HAVE CHILDREN IN EITHER THE PUBLIC OR SEPARATE SCHOOL SYSTEMS AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HAVE CHILDREN IN EITHER SYSTEM.

IT IS GENERALLY ASSUMED THAT MALE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WILL BE MORE INTERESTED IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS THAN FEMALES SINCE THEY ARE THE ONES WHO ARE OFTEN HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS OF EDUCATION; BUT THERE IS THE PROBABILITY THAT FEMALES, BECAUSE OF THEIR INTERACTIONS OVER COFFEE BREAKS AND THEIR PROXIMITY TO THEIR CHILDREN, WILL BE MORE ACTIVE.

CONSEQUENTLY, HYPOTHESIS 19 WAS DEVELOPED:

H₁₉: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO ARE CLASSIFIED AS MALES AND THOSE WHO ARE CLASSIFIED AS FEMALES.

IT IS GENERALLY FELT THAT SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAVE ATTAINED A HIGHER FORMAL EDUCATION LEVEL WILL BE MORE INTERESTED IN EDUCATION THAN THOSE WITH LESS EDUCATION; BUT THERE IS THE POSSIBILITY THAT SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WITHOUT A GOOD FORMAL EDUCATION WILL WORK HARD TO PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES THAT THEY DID NOT HAVE. THEREFORE, THE FOLLOWING HYPOTHESIS WAS TESTED:

H₂₀: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO ARE CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION.

IT IS SOMETIMES FELT THAT INDIVIDUALS WHO SEEK GOVERNMENTAL POSITIONS BECAUSE OF THEIR OWN INTERESTS WILL BE MORE INTERESTED THAN THOSE WHO ACHIEVE THEIR POSITIONS THROUGH APPOINTMENT. THEREFORE, HYPOTHESIS 21 WAS FORMULATED:

H₂₁: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO ACHIEVED THEIR POSITIONS THROUGH ELECTION AND THOSE WHO BECAME BOARD MEMBERS THROUGH APPOINTMENT.

IT SEEMS REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT INDIVIDUALS WITH A BACKGROUND IN EDUCATION WOULD PARTICIPATE MORE IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS THAN THOSE WITH OTHER BACKGROUNDS. NEVERTHELESS, INDIVIDUALS ASSOCIATED WITH OTHER BACKGROUNDS MAY VIEW EDUCATION MORE OBJECTIVELY. THEREFORE, HYPOTHESIS 22 WAS FORMULATED:

H_{22} : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO ONCE HELD THE POSITION OF SCHOOL TEACHER AND/OR ADMINISTRATOR PRIOR TO THEIR SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE AND THOSE WHO DID NOT.

HYPOTHESIS 23 WAS DEVELOPED IN ORDER TO TEST FOR DIFFERENCES IN PARTICIPATION BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO THE TIME IN YEARS THAT INDIVIDUALS RESIDED IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

H_{23} : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES WHEN GROUPED ACCORDING TO THE TIME RESIDED IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

SUMMARY

ONCE AGAIN, THE TWO BASIC QUESTIONS TO BE RESOLVED IN THIS STUDY WERE:

1. TO WHAT EXTENT DO FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPATE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS WITHIN THEIR COMMUNITIES AFTER THEY HAVE COMPLETED THEIR BOARD SERVICE?

2. ARE THERE ANY CHARACTERISTICS, OF THE INDIVIDUAL, OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM, OR OF THE COMMUNITY, WHICH CORRELATE WITH THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS?

FIFTY-FOUR ALBERTA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS WERE SURVEYED IN THIS STUDY. FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, RETIRED FROM THE SCHOOL BOARD DURING THE PAST TEN YEARS AND STILL RESIDING IN THE COMMUNITY, PARTICIPATED IN THIS STUDY.

THE FIRST PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE OBTAINED PERSONAL AND COMMUNITY INFORMATION ABOUT THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER, HIS SCHOOL SYSTEM, AND HIS COMMUNITY; WHILE THE SECOND PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ATTEMPTED TO DETERMINE THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER'S PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF HIS COMMUNITY ONCE HE HAD COMPLETED HIS SERVICE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD. THIS INFORMATION WAS TREATED STATISTICALLY IN AN EFFORT TO LOCATE CORRELATIONS OF THESE VARIABLES WITH THE PARTICIPATION SCORES.

PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES WERE GROUPED INTO FOUR MAIN DIMENSIONS: (1) INFORMATION-SEEKING ACTIVITIES, (2) ADVICE-GIVING ACTIVITIES, (3) CAMPAIGNING ACTIVITIES, AND (4) DIRECT-PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES. FROM THIS GROUP-

ING, A TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORE FOR EACH RESPONDENT WAS OBTAINED.

HYPOTHESES WERE DEVELOPED AND ORDERED INTO FIVE BASIC CATEGORIES: (1) OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION, (2) BOARD CHARACTERISTICS, (3) INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES, (4) PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS, AND (5) FACTORS RELATED TO BOARD SERVICE.

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WAS USED TO TEST FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SUB-GROUPS. AN ALPHA LEVEL OF 0.05 WAS SET AS THE LEVEL OF PROBABILITY AT WHICH THE DIFFERENCES WERE CONSIDERED STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT.

CHAPTER IV

CHARACTERISTICS OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, THEIR SCHOOL SYSTEMS, AND THEIR COMMUNITIES

ONE OF THE AIMS OF THIS RESEARCH WAS TO ACCOUNT FOR THE VARIABLES OF PARTICIPATION OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES. THEREFORE, VARIABLES WHICH MIGHT CORRELATE WITH PARTICIPATION WERE IDENTIFIED. THESE VARIABLES WERE RELATED TO THE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM IN WHICH THEY SERVED, AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COMMUNITY IN WHICH THEY LIVED.

THE INFORMATION RELATING TO THESE VARIABLES WAS OBTAINED FROM THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND IS PRESENTED IN THIS CHAPTER. IT WILL BE STATISTICALLY ANALYZED IN THE NEXT CHAPTER TO FIND OUT WHICH, IF ANY, OF THE VARIABLES ARE RELATED TO PARTICIPATION.

CHARACTERISTICS OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

AGE OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER

TABLE I ANALYZES THE NUMBER AND PER CENT OF RESPONDENTS WHO WERE IN THE DIFFERENT AGE CATEGORIES. OF THE 195 RESPONDENTS, 47 OR 24.1 PER CENT REPORTED THAT THEY WERE IN THE 45-50 YEAR AGE GROUP WHILE ONLY 10 INDIVIDUALS OR 5.1 PER CENT INDICATED THAT THEY WERE UNDER 40 YEARS OF AGE. THIS SAMPLE INDICATED THAT THE AVERAGE AGE OF AN ALBERTA FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER WAS 53 YEARS.

TABLE I

AGE OF RESPONDENTS

| AGE | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|----------|--------|----------|
| UNDER 40 | 10 | 5.1 |
| 40-45 | 26 | 13.3 |
| 45-50 | 47 | 24.1 |
| 50-55 | 17 | 8.7 |
| 55-60 | 43 | 22.1 |
| 60-65 | 21 | 10.8 |
| OVER 65 | 31 | 22.1 |

LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

THE LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IS SUMMARIZED IN TABLE II. ONE HUNDRED SIXTEEN INDIVIDUALS OUT OF THE 195 RESPONDENTS OR 60.1 PER CENT OF FORMER ALBERTA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS HAD AT MOST A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION AND YET THEY HAD

CONSIDERABLE AUTHORITY AS TO THE TYPE OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM THAT WAS TO PREVAIL IN THEIR SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

TABLE II

LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF RESPONDENTS

| EDUCATION | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|----------------------|--------|----------|
| BELOW HIGH SCHOOL | 12 | 6.2 |
| SOME HIGH SCHOOL | 73 | 37.8 |
| HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE | 31 | 16.1 |
| SOME UNIVERSITY | 29 | 15.0 |
| UNIVERSITY GRADUATE | 24 | 12.4 |
| SOME GRADUATE WORK | 8 | 4.1 |
| GRADUATE DEGREE | 16 | 8.3 |

OCCUPATIONS OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

AN INDICATION OF THE OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENTS IS PROVIDED BY TABLE III. SEVENTY-SIX OUT OF 193 RESPONDENTS OR 39.4 PER CENT REPORTED THAT THEY WERE ENGAGED IN BUSINESS EITHER IN THE PRIORITY OR MANAGERIAL AND/OR OFFICIAL CAPACITIES WHILE 63 RESPONDENTS OR 32.6 PER CENT REPORTED THAT THEY WERE ENGAGED IN SOME FORM OF AGRICULTURE. ONLY 8 RESPONDENTS OR 4.1 PER CENT OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WERE MAKING A LIVELIHOOD FROM EDUCATION BY EITHER TEACHING IN A VOCATIONAL SCHOOL OR UNIVERSITY.

TABLE III
OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENTS

| OCCUPATION | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|-------------------------------------------|--------|----------|
| AGRICULTURE | 63 | 32.6 |
| MEDICINE, DENTISTRY, PHARMACY | 17 | 8.8 |
| LAW | 6 | 3.1 |
| BUSINESS (MANAGERIAL, OFFICIAL, PROP.) | 76 | 39.4 |
| NURSING | 2 | 1.0 |
| CIVIL SERVANTS | 5 | 2.6 |
| HOUSEWIFE | 11 | 5.7 |
| EDUCATION | 8 | 4.1 |
| LABORER | 5 | 2.6 |

PARENTAL INTEREST (CHILDREN IN SCHOOL) OF FORMER SCHOOL

BOARD MEMBERS

NINETY-FIVE RESPONDENTS OR 49.5 PER CENT INDICATED THAT THEY STILL HAD CHILDREN ATTENDING SCHOOL WHILE 97 RESPONDENTS OR 50.5 PER CENT REPORTED THAT THEY HAD NO CHILDREN ATTENDING PUBLIC OR SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

TABLE IV
PARENTAL INTEREST OF RESPONDENTS
(CHILDREN ATTENDING PUBLIC AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS)

| CHILDREN IN SCHOOL | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|--------------------|--------|----------|
| YES | 95 | 49.5 |
| NO | 97 | 50.5 |

TENURE OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

TABLE V INDICATES THAT MOST OF THE SURVEYED FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS HAD SERVED APPROXIMATELY EIGHT YEARS ON SCHOOL BOARDS. EIGHTEEN RESPONDENTS OR 9.4 PER CENT SERVED 16 YEARS OR MORE ON BOARDS OF EDUCATION. ONLY 8 RESPONDENTS OR 4.2 PER CENT SERVED ON SCHOOL BOARDS LESS THAN TWO YEARS.

TABLE V
TENURE OF RESPONDENTS
(NUMBER OF YEARS ON SCHOOL BOARD)

| TENURE | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|-------------------|--------|----------|
| LESS THAN 2 YEARS | 8 | 4.2 |
| 2-4 YEARS | 47 | 24.5 |
| 4-6 YEARS | 29 | 15.1 |
| 6-8 YEARS | 37 | 19.3 |
| 8-10 YEARS | 19 | 9.9 |
| 10-12 YEARS | 16 | 8.3 |
| 12-14 YEARS | 7 | 3.6 |
| 14-16 YEARS | 11 | 5.7 |
| OVER 16 YEARS | 18 | 9.4 |

REGENCY OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE

TABLE VI, REGENCY OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE, ILLUSTRATES THAT THE LARGEST NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS (42) INDICATED THAT THEY HAD MORE THAN EIGHT YEARS OF TENURE ON SCHOOL BOARDS EVEN THOUGH THEY REPRESENTED 21.8 PER CENT OF THE SAMPLE. APPROXIMATELY 50 PER CENT OF THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED THAT IT WAS FIVE YEARS AGO THAT

THEY HAD SERVED ON SCHOOL BOARDS.

TABLE VI
RECENCY OF BOARD SERVICE OF RESPONDENTS
(NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE BOARD SERVICE)

| NUMBER OF YEARS | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|-----------------------|--------|----------|
| 1 YEAR AGO | 27 | 14.0 |
| 2 YEARS AGO | 18 | 9.3 |
| 3 YEARS AGO | 11 | 5.7 |
| 4 YEARS AGO | 21 | 10.9 |
| 5 YEARS AGO | 26 | 13.5 |
| 6 YEARS AGO | 19 | 9.8 |
| 7 YEARS AGO | 29 | 15.0 |
| MORE THAN 8 YEARS AGO | 42 | 21.8 |

METHODS OF SELECTING SCHOOL BOARD CANDIDATES

IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ARE ELECTED TO THEIR POSITION BY THE PEOPLE RESIDING IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS. HOWEVER, THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION HAS BROAD POWERS IN EDUCATION. PART THREE, BOARD OF TRUSTEES, SECTION 30(1) READS:

FOR EACH PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT NOT INCLUDED IN A DIVISION, THE MINISTER SHALL ESTABLISH A BOARD AND THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ARE A CORPORATION UNDER THE NAME OF: "THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF _____ SCHOOL DISTRICT No. _____".

SECTION 31(1) FURTHER READS:

WHERE A TRUSTEE IS NOT ELECTED OR AN APPOINTMENT REQUIRED TO BE MADE BY THIS ACT IS NOT MADE, THE MINISTER MAY:

(A) APPOINT A PERSON AS A TRUSTEE OR APPOINT A PERSON TO THAT POSITION, OR,

(B) DIRECT THAT AN ELECTION BE HELD TO FILL A VACANCY REQUIRED TO BE FILLED BY AN ELECTED PERSON.⁴⁸

TABLE VII SHOWS THAT 92.7 PER CENT OF THE SURVEYED FORMER BOARD MEMBERS HAD BEEN ELECTED TO THE BOARD WHILE ONLY 7.3 PER CENT HAD BEEN APPOINTED.

TABLE VII

METHOD BY WHICH RESPONDENTS BECAME BOARD MEMBERS

| METHOD | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|-----------|--------|----------|
| ELECTED | 178 | 92.7 |
| APPOINTED | 14 | 7.3 |

REASONS FOR SEEKING SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERSHIP

AN ATTEMPT WAS MADE TO FIND OUT THE REASONS THAT PROMPTED THE INDIVIDUALS TO SEEK MEMBERSHIP ON THE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD. IN SOME CASES, THE REAL UNDERLYING REASON MAY NOT HAVE BEEN REPORTED.

THE TWO MOST PROMINENT REASONS GIVEN BY THE RESPONDENTS WERE THAT THEY WERE URGED BY FRIENDS (84 RESPONDENTS OR 44.4 PER CENT) AND THAT THEY WERE URGED TO RUN BY A GROUP (52 RESPONDENTS OR 27.5 PER CENT). ONLY 12 RESPONDENTS OR 6.3 PER CENT RAN FOR ELECTION ON SCHOOL

⁴⁸ALBERTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, BILL 35 AN ACT RESPECTING SCHOOLS. (EDMONTON: QUEEN'S PRINTER, 1970), P. 13.

BOARDS BECAUSE THEY WERE DISSATISFIED WITH EXISTING SITUATIONS WITHIN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM.

TABLE VIII

REASONS FOR SEEKING MEMBERSHIP ON BOARD

| REASONS | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|----------|
| URGED TO RUN BY GROUP | 52 | 27.5 |
| URGED TO RUN BY FRIENDS | 84 | 44.4 |
| FELT IT WAS MY CIVIC DUTY | 36 | 19.0 |
| DISSATISFIED WITH EXISTING SITUATION(S) WITHIN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM | 12 | 6.3 |
| WANTED TO BECOME INVOLVED IN COMMUNITY POLITICS | 4 | 2.1 |
| ENCOURAGED BY A PARTICULAR EVENT | 0 | 0.0 |
| FELT THAT SOMEONE HAD TO SEE THAT SCHOOL COSTS WERE KEPT DOWN | 1 | 0.5 |

RETIREMENT FROM SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE

THE FOUR WAYS OF RETIRING FROM SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE IN ALBERTA, AS GIVEN BY THE RESPONDENTS, WERE:

- (1) NOT SEEKING RE-ELECTION TO THE BOARD
- (2) BEING DEFEATED FOR RE-ELECTION
- (3) RESIGNING FROM OFFICE
- (4) RECALL.

ONLY ONE RESPONDENT REPORTED THAT HE HAD BEEN RECALLED. BILL 35, THE NEW SCHOOL ACT, PART 3, SECTION 32(1) OUTLINES WHEN AN INDIVIDUAL IS NOT QUALIFIED TO RE-

MAIN A TRUSTEE. EIGHTY-FOUR RESPONDENTS OR 62.2 PER CENT DID NOT SEEK SCHOOL BOARD RE-ELECTION AND ONE-QUARTER OF THE RESPONDENTS RAN FOR RE-ELECTION BUT WERE DEFEATED AT THE POLLS.

TABLE IX
RETIREMENT FROM BOARD SERVICE

| REASONS | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|----------------------------------------|--------|----------|
| DID NOT SEEK RE-ELECTION | 125 | 66.1 |
| RAN FOR RE-ELECTION BUT NOT ELECTED | 45 | 23.8 |
| RESIGNED | 18 | 9.5 |
| RECALLED | 1 | 0.5 |

PREVIOUS INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS

TABLE X SHOWS THAT 64 RESPONDENTS OR 47.1 PER CENT OF THE SURVEYED FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN THE EXECUTIVE POSITION OF THE HOME AND SCHOOL ORGANIZATION PRIOR TO THEIR SERVICE ON SCHOOL BOARDS. ONE-QUARTER OF THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED THAT THEY ATTENDED SCHOOL BOARD MEETINGS PRIOR TO THEIR SERVICE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD. ONLY TEN RESPONDENTS OR 7.4 PER CENT ACTIVELY PARTICIPATED AS MEMBERS ON CITIZENS' COMMITTEES SUCH AS THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE. PERHAPS THE LOW PERCENTAGE FOR THIS CATEGORY IS THAT CITIZENS' COMMITTEES ARE AN INNOVATION IN ALBERTA.

TABLE X

PREVIOUS INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS

| PREVIOUS INVOLVEMENT | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|----------|
| HOME AND SCHOOL OFFICER OR LEADER | 64 | 47.1 |
| MEMBER OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY SCHOOL DISTRICT (E.G., SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE) | 6 | 4.4 |
| ATTENDED BOARD MEETINGS | 36 | 26.7 |
| APPEARED AND SPOKE BEFORE THE BOARD ON SPECIFIC ISSUES | 6 | 4.4 |
| ACTIVELY PARTICIPATED AS A MEMBER OF A CITIZENS' COMMITTEE | 10 | 7.4 |
| FORMER BOARD MEMBER PRIOR LARGER UNIT | 10 | 7.4 |
| BOARD SECRETARY-TREASURER IN SMALL UNIT | 4 | 2.9 |

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN SCHOOL DISTRICT

SEVENTY-SIX RESPONDENTS OR 39.8 PER CENT REPORTED THAT THEY LIVED OVER FORTY YEARS IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT WHICH THEY REPRESENTED ON THE SCHOOL BOARD. ONLY NINE RESPONDENTS OR 4.7 PER CENT DECLARED THAT THEY HAD RESIDED LESS THAN A DECADE IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN WHICH THEY SERVED.

TABLE XI

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN SCHOOL DISTRICT

| YEARS | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|---------------|--------|----------|
| 0-5 YEARS | 0 | 0.0 |
| 5-10 YEARS | 9 | 4.7 |
| 10-15 YEARS | 17 | 8.9 |
| 15-20 YEARS | 25 | 13.1 |
| 20-25 YEARS | 27 | 14.1 |
| 25-30 YEARS | 14 | 7.3 |
| 30-35 YEARS | 10 | 5.2 |
| 35-40 YEARS | 13 | 6.8 |
| OVER 40 YEARS | 76 | 39.8 |

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE AS AN EDUCATOR

TWENTY-FOUR RESPONDENTS OR 12.3 PER CENT HAD EXPERIENCE AS TEACHERS OR ADMINISTRATORS PRIOR TO SERVING ON THE BOARDS WHILE 171 RESPONDENTS OR 87.7 PER CENT HAD NO PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE AS EDUCATORS.

TABLE XII

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE AS AN EDUCATOR

| EXPERIENCE | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|------------|--------|----------|
| Yes | 24 | 12.3 |
| No | 171 | 87.7 |

ELECTION TO OTHER PUBLIC GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY AFTER
SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE

IN SPITE OF THE ALLEGATION THAT MANY PEOPLE USE THE SCHOOL BOARD AS A STEPPING STONE TO HIGHER POLITICAL

OFFICE, ONLY 24 RESPONDENTS OR 12.3 PER CENT OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO WERE STUDIED WERE ELECTED TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL UNITS UPON COMPLETION OF THEIR SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE.

THOSE WHO INDICATED THAT THEY WERE LATER ELECTED TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL POSITIONS NOTED SUCH AGENCIES AS SPECIAL AREAS, CITY COUNCIL, PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL POLITICS, COUNTY DRAINAGE COMMITTEE, AND PROVINCIAL WHEAT BOARD EXECUTIVE. TABLE XIII ILLUSTRATES THAT 171 RESPONDENTS OR 87.7 PER CENT WERE NOT ELECTED TO ANOTHER GOVERNMENTAL POSITION AFTER THEIR SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE.

TABLE XIII

ELECTED TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL POSITION
AFTER SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE

| ELECTED | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|---------|--------|----------|
| Yes | 24 | 12.3 |
| No | 171 | 87.7 |

APPOINTED TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL BOARD

FIFTY-SIX RESPONDENTS OR 28.9 PER CENT INDICATED THAT THEY SERVED AS APPOINTED OFFICIALS ON OTHER GOVERNMENTAL BOARDS AFTER THEIR RETIREMENT FROM THE SCHOOL BOARD. AMONG SOME OF THE EXAMPLES CITED FOR OTHER GOVERNMENTAL BOARDS WERE HOSPITAL BOARDS, LIBRARY BOARDS,

NURSING HOME BOARD, JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD, CIVIL DEFENSE BOARD, CURRICULUM COMMITTEE BOARD, AND RURAL TELEPHONES BOARD. ONE HUNDRED THIRTY-EIGHT RESPONDENTS OR 71.1 PER CENT REPORTED THAT THEY WERE NOT APPOINTED TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL BOARDS AFTER THEIR SCHOOL BOARD TENURE.

TABLE XIV

APPOINTED TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL BOARD
AFTER SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE

| APPOINTED | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|-----------|--------|----------|
| Yes | 56 | 28.9 |
| No | 138 | 71.1 |

CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

INCUMBENCY OF SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

TABLE XV, THROUGH THE REPORTING OF THE SURVEYED FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, ILLUSTRATES THAT NINETY-EIGHT RESPONDENTS OR 52.1 PER CENT WERE SERVING ON THE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD WHEN THE CURRENT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS WAS IN OFFICE.

TABLE XV

BOARD SERVICE UNDER CURRENT SUPERINTENDENT

| CURRENT SUPERINTENDENT | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|------------------------|--------|----------|
| Yes | 90 | 46.9 |
| No | 101 | 52.6 |
| No response | 1 | 0.5 |

NUMBER OF BOARD MEMBERS ON YOUR LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD

RESPONSES FROM THE SURVEYED FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ILLUSTRATE THAT THE FIVE OR SEVEN-MAN BOARDS ARE POPULAR IN ALBERTA. THIRTY-TWO RESPONDENTS OR 17.1 PER CENT REPORTED LARGE LOCAL BOARDS SERVING LARGE ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS.

THE RESPONDENTS REPORTING A SMALL NUMBER OF MEMBERS REPRESENTED AREAS IN WHICH THEY WERE APPOINTED AS TRUSTEES BY THE GOVERNMENT.

TABLE XVI

NUMBER OF BOARD MEMBERS ON YOUR LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD

| NUMBER OF MEMBERS | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|-------------------|--------|----------|
| ONE | 5 | 2.7 |
| TWO | 1 | 0.5 |
| THREE | 3 | 1.6 |
| FIVE | 57 | 30.5 |
| SIX | 26 | 13.9 |
| SEVEN | 57 | 30.5 |
| EIGHT | 6 | 3.2 |
| NINE OR MORE | 32 | 17.1 |

MEMBERSHIP IN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

RESPONDENTS WERE ASKED TO CHECK THE ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH THEY PARTICIPATED PRIOR, DURING, AND AFTER THEIR SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE.

IF THE RESPONDENTS CHECKED OR LISTED SIX OR MORE ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH THEY WERE ACTIVE, THEY WERE CLASS-

IFIED AS HIGH PARTICIPANTS; IF RESPONDENTS CHECKED OR LISTED THREE TO FIVE ORGANIZATIONS, THEY WERE REPORTED AS MODERATE PARTICIPANTS; AND IF A SURVEYED RESPONDENT CHECKED OR LISTED TWO OR FEWER, THE RESPONDENT WAS CLASSIFIED AS A LOW PARTICIPANT.

IT IS INTERESTING TO SEE FROM TABLE XVII THAT SEVENTY-FOUR RESPONDENTS OR 38.1 PER CENT REPORTED THAT THEY ACTIVELY PARTICIPATED IN TWO OR FEWER ORGANIZATIONS. ONE HUNDRED RESPONDENTS OR 51.5 PER CENT REPORTED PARTICIPATION IN THREE TO FIVE ORGANIZATIONS.

TABLE XVII

MEMBERSHIP PARTICIPATION IN ORGANIZATIONS

| PARTICIPATION | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|---------------|--------|----------|
| HIGH | 20 | 10.3 |
| MODERATE | 100 | 51.5 |
| LOW | 74 | 38.1 |

SEX OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

TABLE XVIII ILLUSTRATES THAT ONE HUNDRED SEVENTY-EIGHT OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS OR 91.3 PER CENT WERE MALES AND ONLY SEVENTEEN OR 8.7 PER CENT OF THE RESPONDENTS WERE FEMALE.

TABLE XVIII

SEX OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER

| SEX | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|--------|--------|----------|
| MALE | 178 | 91.3 |
| FEMALE | 17 | 8.7 |

NUMBER OF CURRENT SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS YOU SERVED WITH

ALL RESPONDENTS REPORTED THAT THERE WERE STILL INDIVIDUALS ON THE SCHOOL BOARD WHO HAD SERVED AT THE SAME TIME AS THE RESPONDENTS. ONE HUNDRED THIRTY-SEVEN RESPONDENTS OR 71.0 PER CENT INDICATED THAT TWO MEMBERS WITH WHOM THEY HAD SERVED WERE STILL ON THE BOARD.

TABLE XIX

NUMBER OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS YOU SERVED WITH

| NUMBER OF CURRENT MEMBERS | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|---------------------------|--------|----------|
| ONE | 16 | 8.3 |
| TWO | 137 | 71.0 |
| THREE | 29 | 15.0 |
| FOUR | 1 | 0.5 |
| FIVE | 3 | 1.6 |
| SIX | 7 | 3.6 |

EXISTENCE OF MAJOR CONTROVERSY IN SCHOOL DISTRICT

TABLE XX ILLUSTRATES THAT ONE HUNDRED SIXTY-FIVE RESPONDENTS OR 85.1 PER CENT INDICATED THAT NO MAJOR CONTROVERSY EXISTED IN THEIR SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHEN THEY

SERVED IN OFFICE. TWENTY-NINE RESPONDENTS OR 14.9 PER CENT REPORTED THAT A MAJOR CONTROVERSY DID EXIST IN THEIR SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

TABLE XX

EXISTENCE OF MAJOR CONTROVERSY IN SCHOOL DISTRICT

| WHETHER CONTROVERSY EXISTED | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|
| Yes | 29 | 14.9 |
| No | 165 | 85.1 |

MAJOR CONTROVERSY

DURING THIS SURVEYED PERIOD, THE MOST CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE SEEMED TO BE BOARD-ADMINISTRATION CONFLICT. NO ONE INDICATED THAT THERE HAD BEEN ANY MAJOR CONTROVERSY OVER SITE SELECTION. THE LOW NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS THAT REPORTED REORGANIZATION OR CENTRALIZATION AS MAJOR ISSUES IS PROBABLY DUE TO THE FACT THAT MOST OF ALBERTA'S CENTRALIZATION WAS COMPLETED BY THIS TIME AND THE REGIONAL DISTRICT IDEA WAS STILL UNTESTED.

TABLE XXI

MAJOR CONTROVERSY

| MAJOR CONTROVERSY | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|----------------------------------|--------|----------|
| BUDGET AND FINANCIAL MATTERS | 16 | 8.4 |
| BOARD-ADMINISTRATION CONFLICT | 137 | 71.7 |
| REORGANIZATION OR CENTRALIZATION | 28 | 14.7 |
| ACADEMIC FREEDOM | 1 | 0.5 |
| CURRICULUM MATTERS | 2 | 1.0 |
| PERSONAL MATTERS | 7 | 3.7 |
| SITE SELECTION | 0 | 0.0 |

BOARD ENCOURAGEMENT FOR FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERSTO REMAIN ACTIVE

TABLE XXII MAY ILLUSTRATE THAT EIGHTY-ONE RESPONDENTS OR 42.2 PER CENT INDICATED THAT THEIR DISTRICT PROVIDES ENCOURAGEMENT FOR FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TO REMAIN ACTIVE AND INTERESTED IN SCHOOL AFFAIRS BY PROVIDING COPIES OF BOARD MEETING MINUTES, COURTESY CARDS FOR SCHOOL ACTIVITIES, INVITATIONS TO BOARD MEETINGS, AND REQUESTS TO SERVE ON ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

TABLE XXII

ENCOURAGEMENT TO REMAIN ACTIVE

| ENCOURAGEMENT | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|---------------|--------|----------|
| Yes | 81 | 42.2 |
| No | 111 | 57.8 |

CHARACTERISTICS OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS

TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

TABLE XXIII SHOWS THAT SIXTY-NINE RESPONDENTS OR 35.4 PER CENT REPRESENTED LARGE ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS WITH LOCALLY APPOINTED SUPERINTENDENTS; SIXTY-THREE RESPONDENTS OR 32.3 PER CENT REPRESENTED COUNTIES; AND SIXTY-THREE RESPONDENTS OR 32.3 PER CENT SERVED ON SCHOOL DIVISION BOARDS. A CROSS-SECTION OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WAS THUS APPARENTLY OBTAINED.

TABLE XXIII

TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

| TYPE OF UNIT | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|-----------------------|--------|----------|
| COUNTY | 63 | 32.3 |
| DIVISION | 63 | 32.3 |
| LARGE SCHOOL DISTRICT | 69 | 35.4 |

SIZE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

ONE HUNDRED THREE RESPONDENTS OR 54.4 PER CENT CAME FROM ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS OF 100 TO 500 TEACHERS WHILE ONLY TWENTY-SIX FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS OR 13.3 PER CENT HAD REPRESENTED LARGE UNITS WITH 500 OR MORE TEACHERS. SIXTY-THREE RESPONDENTS OR 32.3 PER CENT HAD SERVED ON SMALL ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS WITH 100 TEACHERS OR LESS.

TABLE XXIV

SIZE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

| SIZE | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|--------------------------------|--------|----------|
| SMALL (LESS THAN 100 TEACHERS) | 63 | 32.3 |
| MODERATELY LARGE (100-500) | 103 | 54.4 |
| LARGE (MORE THAN 500) | 26 | 13.3 |

SCHOOL BOARD POLICY-MAKING PROCESS

EIGHTY-SIX RESPONDENTS OR 44.8 PER CENT REPORTED THAT THEY HAD SERVED ON SCHOOL BOARDS IN WHICH POLICIES EMERGED FROM A RATIONAL POLICY-MAKING PROCESS WHERE THE CONSIDERED OPINIONS OF THE TOTAL BODY WERE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT AND THAT THE BOARD WAS GENERALLY IN AGREEMENT ON DECISIONS. TWENTY-FOUR RESPONDENTS OR 12.5 PER CENT INDICATED THAT THEY HAD SERVED ON A SCHOOL BOARD THAT WAS DOMINATED BY ONE STRONG MEMBER.

TABLE XXV

SCHOOL BOARD POLICY-MAKING PROCESS

| POLICY-MAKING PROCESS | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|----------------------------------------|--------|----------|
| DOMINATED | 24 | 12.5 |
| RATIONAL | 86 | 44.8 |
| SPLIT-VOTE | 19 | 9.9 |
| DOMINATED AND RATIONAL | 16 | 8.3 |
| RATIONAL AND SPLIT-VOTE | 17 | 8.9 |
| DOMINATED, RATIONAL, AND SPLIT-VOTE | 23 | 12.0 |

CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES

COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE

COMMUNITY DECISIONS ARE GENERALLY MADE IN TWO WAYS. RESPONDENTS WERE ASKED TO STUDY THE TWO LISTS IN TABLE XXVI AND CHECK WHICH TYPE DESCRIBED THE COMMUNITY IN WHICH THEY LIVE.

TABLE XXVI

COMMUNITY DECISION-MAKING

| TYPE A | TYPE B |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| DECISIONS INFLUENCED BY ONE INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP. | MANY CITIZENS PARTICIPATE IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS. |
| CITIZENS ARE NOT INVOLVED IN COMMUNITY PLANNING. | CITIZENS PARTICIPATE IN COMMUNITY PLANNING. |
| LEADERS DO NOT SEEK OPINIONS OF CITIZENS. | LEADERS SEEK THE OPINIONS OF CITIZENS. |
| PUBLIC HEARINGS ARE SELDOM HELD. | PEOPLE ARE GIVEN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS THEMSELVES AT PUBLIC HEARINGS. |

TYPE A WAS CATEGORIZED AS A MONOLITHIC-POWER STRUCTURED COMMUNITY AND TYPE B WAS CLASSED AS A PLURALISTIC-POWER-STRUCTURED ONE.

TABLE XXVII INDICATES THAT EIGHTY-ONE OF THE SURVEYED RESPONDENTS OR 42.2 PER CENT REPORTED THAT THEY CAME FROM A MONOLITHIC-POWER-STRUCTURED COMMUNITY WHILE 111 RESPONDENTS OR 57.8 PER CENT CAME FROM A PLURALISTIC-STRUCTURED ONE.

TABLE XXVII

COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE

| POWER STRUCTURE | NUMBER | PER CENT |
|-----------------|--------|----------|
| MONOLITHIC | 81 | 42.2 |
| PLURALISTIC | 111 | 57.8 |

SUMMARY

CHAPTER IV ILLUSTRATED THE CHARACTERISTICS OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, THEIR SCHOOL SYSTEMS, AND THEIR COMMUNITIES. THE SURVEY, BESIDES PROVIDING USEFUL INFORMATION, IS BASIC TO FURTHER ANALYSIS RELATING CHARACTERISTICS TO PARTICIPATION OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES.

CHAPTER V

PARTICIPATION OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES

FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WERE STUDIED AS A GROUP IN THIS RESEARCH TO DETERMINE THE DEGREE OF THEIR CONTINUED PARTICIPATION IN MATTERS RELATING TO EDUCATION. THEY WERE, WHILE IN OFFICE, ENTRUSTED WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY OF DETERMINING, IN VARYING DEGREES, THE AFFAIRS OF BOTH PUBLIC AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS AS TO POLICY, FINANCES, PERSONNEL, CONSTRUCTION, AND CURRICULUM. THESE INDIVIDUALS WHO DONATED THEIR TIME AND ENERGY TO BOARD MEETINGS AND INDIVIDUAL CONSULTATION, USUALLY OVER AN EXTENDED PERIOD OF TIME AND AT CONSIDERABLE EXPENDITURE OF EFFORT, HAVE ONE THING IN COMMON - ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES.

THE QUESTION TO WHICH THIS RESEARCH WAS DIRECTED WAS: TO WHAT EXTENT DO THESE SAME INDIVIDUALS PARTICIPATE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES AFTER THEY HAVE RETIRED FROM THE SCHOOL BOARD IN WHICH THEY SERVED?

THE RESPONDENTS WERE ASKED IF THEY "FREQUENTLY",

"OCCASIONALLY", OR "NEVER" PARTICIPATED IN SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES AS SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS. THESE ACTIVITIES WERE ARRANGED TO SOME EXTENT IN AN HIERARCHICAL ORDER IN WHICH RESPONDENTS WERE MERELY SEEKING INFORMATION TO ACTIVITIES IN WHICH THEY WERE ACTUALLY SERVING ON OTHER EDUCATIONAL BOARDS. MILBRATH'S⁴⁹ GUIDELINES FORMED THE BASIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE: "A GENERAL CHARACTERISTIC OF LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION IS THAT THEY CONSTITUTE AN HIERARCHY OF COSTS. TIME AND ENERGY COSTS ARE LEAST FOR THE ACTIVITIES AT THE BOTTOM OF THE HIERARCHY. THE HIGHER ONES REQUIRE A GREATER PERSONAL COMMITMENT."

AS WAS PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED, PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY WERE DIVIDED INTO FOUR DIMENSIONS. THESE WERE: (1) INFORMATION-SEEKING ACTIVITIES, (2) ADVICE-GIVING ACTIVITIES, (3) CAMPAIGNING ACTIVITIES, AND (4) DIRECT PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES.

EACH OF THESE DIMENSIONS WILL BE DISCUSSED SEPARATELY AND THEN FOLLOWED BY A SUMMARY OF PARTICIPATION.

PARTICIPATION IN INFORMATION-SEEKING ACTIVITIES

AS INDICATED IN TABLE XXVIII, 52.5 PER CENT OF THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED THAT THEY NEVER PERSONALLY TELE-

⁴⁹ MILBRATH, STUDY ON POLITICAL PARTICIPATION (CHICAGO, ILL: RAND McNALLY AND COMPANY, 1965.)

PHONED THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER. FORTY-SEVEN AND ONE-HALF PER CENT INDICATED THAT THEY HAD SOUGHT THE SUPERINTENDENT'S ADVICE.

FIFTY-TWO AND ONE-HALF PER CENT OF THE SURVEYED FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS HAD NEVER PERSONALLY TELEPHONED A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER.

MORE THAN HALF OF THE RESPONDENTS INDICATED THAT THEY HAD GONE FROM ONE TIME TO ANOTHER TO THE SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER.

OVER TWO-THIRDS OF THE RESPONDENTS INDICATED THAT THEY HAD INFORMALLY SOUGHT INFORMATION OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FROM FRIENDS, RELATIVES, OR BUSINESS ASSOCIATES. FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WERE JUST AS PRONE TO SEEK INFORMATION FROM CURRENT BOARD MEMBERS DURING INFORMAL SOCIAL SETTINGS AS IN FORMAL CONSULTATION SESSIONS.

ABOUT 50 PER CENT OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS HAVE PERSONALLY CONTACTED A TEACHER IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER. FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WERE SLIGHTLY MORE PRONE TO CON-

SULTING WITH TEACHERS RATHER THAN WITH THE SUPERINTENDENT
IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM.

DURING THE ONE-YEAR PERIOD COVERED IN THE STUDY,
76.5 PER CENT HAD NEVER ATTENDED BOARD MEETINGS TO SEEK
INFORMATION OR TO OBSERVE BOARD PROCEEDINGS.

OVER TWO-THIRDS OF THE SURVEYED FORMER SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS INDICATED THAT THEY CONTINUE TO READ SOME
EDUCATIONAL PUBLICATIONS SUCH AS THE ALBERTA SCHOOL
TRUSTEE AND THE A.T.A. MAGAZINE.

TABLE XXVIII

PARTICIPATION IN INFORMATION-SEEKING ACTIVITIES

DURING THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 1968 - APRIL 1969):

24. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY TELEPHONED THE SUPER-
INTENDENT OF SCHOOLS SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT
AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

25. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY TELEPHONED A MEMBER
OR MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD SEEKING INFOR-
MATION ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

26. HAVE YOU GONE TO THE SUPERINTENDENT'S
OFFICE SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT AN
EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

27. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY GONE TO SEE A MEMBER
OR MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD SEEKING INFOR-
MATION ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

28. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED A TEACHER
IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL
MATTER?

29. HAVE YOU ATTENDED BOARD MEETINGS TO
SEEK INFORMATION OR TO OBSERVE?

| FREQUENTLY NO. | % | OCCASIONALLY NO. | % | NEVER NO. | % |
|-------------------|-----|---------------------|------|--------------|------|
| | | | | | |
| 11 | 6.0 | 76 | 41.5 | 96 | 52.5 |
| 9 | 4.9 | 78 | 42.6 | 96 | 52.5 |
| 9 | 4.9 | 60 | 32.8 | 114 | 62.3 |
| 9 | 4.9 | 75 | 42.2 | 98 | 53.9 |
| 12 | 6.6 | 80 | 43.7 | 91 | 49.7 |
| 11 | 6.0 | 32 | 17.5 | 140 | 76.5 |

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

30. HAVE YOU ATTENDED MEETINGS OF A LAY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (E.G., BUILDING COMMITTEE, ETC.) TO SEEK INFORMATION OR TO OBSERVE?

31. HAVE YOU INFORMALLY SOUGHT INFORMATION OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FROM FRIENDS, RELATIVES, OR BUSINESS ASSOCIATES?

32. HAVE YOU SOUGHT INFORMATION OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS DURING INFORMAL SOCIAL SITUATIONS?

33. HAVE YOU SOUGHT INFORMATION OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FROM A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD DURING INFORMAL SOCIAL SITUATIONS?

34. HAVE YOU READ ANY EDUCATIONAL PUBLICATIONS (E.G., ALBERTA SCHOOL TRUSTEES AND ALBERTA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION MAGAZINES, ETC)?

| FREQUENTLY NO. | % | OCCASIONALLY NO. | % | NEVER NO. | % |
|-------------------|------|---------------------|------|--------------|------|
| | | | | | |
| 5 | 2.7 | 31 | 16.9 | 147 | 80.3 |
| 41 | 22.4 | 86 | 47.0 | 56 | 30.6 |
| 10 | 5.5 | 63 | 34.4 | 110 | 60.1 |
| 10 | 5.5 | 77 | 42.1 | 96 | 52.5 |
| 63 | 34.4 | 66 | 36.1 | 54 | 29.5 |

PARTICIPATION IN ADVICE-GIVING ACTIVITIES

THE SECOND TYPE OF PARTICIPATION, ADVICE-GIVING, WAS LESS OFTEN REPORTED BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS.

TABLE XXIX PROVIDES A SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSES.

THE ACTIVITIES INVOLVING THE GIVING OF ADVICE WERE OF TWO TYPES: (1) THOSE IN WHICH THE FORMER BOARD MEMBER WAS SOUGHT OUT BY EDUCATIONAL LEADERS, TEACHERS, OR ASSOCIATES IN THE COMMUNITY FOR HIS ADVICE OR OPINION, AND (2) THOSE IN WHICH HE VOLUNTARILY RENDERED HIS ADVICE OR OPINION. RESPONDENTS DID NOT GENERALLY ASSUME ROLES AS VOLUNTEERS OF ADVICE OR OPINIONS.

TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM AND CURRENT SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS HAD SOUGHT THE ADVICE OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER MORE OFTEN THAN HAD THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS.

APPROXIMATELY 70 PER CENT OF THE RESPONDENTS INDICATED THAT FRIENDS, BUSINESS ASSOCIATES, FELLOW WORKERS, OR RELATIVES SOUGHT THE ADVICE OR OPINION OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS. LESS THAN 20 PER CENT OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ATTENDED BOARD MEETINGS OR LAY COMMITTEES IN WHICH THEY EXPRESSED THEIR OPINIONS OR GAVE THEIR ADVICE TO THE BOARD OR COMMITTEE.

TABLE XXIX

PARTICIPATION IN ADVICE-GIVING ACTIVITIES

DURING THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 1968 - APRIL 1969):

| | FREQUENTLY | | OCCASIONALLY | | NEVER | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|--------------|------|-------|------|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 35. HAVE TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM EVER CONTACTED YOU FOR YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER? | 17 | 9.3 | 73 | 39.9 | 93 | 50.8 |
| 36. HAVE BOARD MEMBERS TELEPHONED YOU TO SEEK YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER? | 7 | 3.8 | 69 | 37.7 | 107 | 58.5 |
| 37. HAS THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS TELEPHONED YOU TO SEEK YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER? | 6 | 3.3 | 45 | 24.6 | 132 | 72.1 |
| 38. HAVE BOARD MEMBERS COME TO SEE YOU SEEKING YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER? | 6 | 3.3 | 62 | 33.9 | 115 | 62.8 |
| 39. HAS THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS COME TO SEE YOU SEEKING YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER? | 3 | 1.6 | 34 | 18.6 | 146 | 79.8 |
| 40. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY TELEPHONED THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS TO GIVE HIM YOUR OPINION OR ADVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER? | 1 | 0.6 | 31 | 16.9 | 151 | 82.5 |

TABLE XXIX (CONTINUED)

| | FREQUENTLY | | OCCASIONALLY | | NEVER | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------|--------------|------|-------|------|
| | NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| 41. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY TELEPHONED A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE BOARD TO GIVE THEM YOUR OPINION OR ADVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER? | 2 | 1.1 | 44 | 24.0 | 137 | 74.8 |
| 42. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY GONE TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOL'S OFFICE TO GIVE HIM YOUR OPINION OR ADVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER? | 3 | 1.6 | 28 | 15.3 | 152 | 83.1 |
| 43. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY GONE TO SEE A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE BOARD TO GIVE THEM YOUR OPINION OR ADVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER? | 2 | 1.1 | 47 | 25.7 | 134 | 73.2 |
| 44. HAVE YOU ATTENDED BOARD MEETINGS IN WHICH YOU EXPRESSED YOUR OPINION OR GAVE ADVICE TO THE BOARD? | 12 | 6.6 | 24 | 13.1 | 147 | 80.3 |
| 45. HAVE YOU ATTENDED A LAY COMMITTEE MEETING (E.G., BUILDING COMMITTEE, ETC.) IN WHICH YOU EXPRESSED AN OPINION OR GAVE ADVICE TO THE COMMITTEE? | 6 | 3.3 | 27 | 14.8 | 150 | 82.0 |
| 46. HAVE FRIENDS, BUSINESS ASSOCIATES, FELLOW WORKERS, OR RELATIVES SOUGHT YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER? | 31 | 16.9 | 98 | 53.6 | 54 | 29.5 |

TABLE XXIX (CONTINUED)

47. HAVE YOU EXPRESSED AN OPINION OR GIVEN
ADVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER TO THE
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS DURING AN IN-
FORMAL SITUATION?

48. HAVE YOU EXPRESSED AN OPINION OR
GIVEN ADVICE TO A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF
THE SCHOOL BOARD ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER
DURING AN INFORMAL SITUATION?

| FREQUENTLY | | OCCASIONALLY | | NEVER | |
|------------|-----|--------------|------|-------|------|
| NO. | % | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| 4 | 2.2 | 46 | 25.1 | 133 | 72.7 |
| 5 | 2.8 | 82 | 45.1 | 95 | 52.2 |

PARTICIPATION IN CAMPAIGNING ACTIVITIES

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEEN RESPONDENTS OR 62.6 PER CENT REPORTED THAT THEY HAD BEEN ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN ENCOURAGING SOMEONE TO RUN FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD.

(TABLE XXX.) THEY WERE NOT ASKED WHAT CRITERIA THEY USED TO SELECT CANDIDATES FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERSHIP.

ABOUT 65 PER CENT OF THE SURVEYED FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS INDICATED THAT THEY HAD NEVER ACTIVELY CAMPAIGNED FOR A SCHOOL BOARD CANDIDATE. NINETY PER CENT OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO WERE SURVEYED SAID THAT THEY HAD NEVER WRITTEN AN EDITORIAL ON AN EDUCATIONAL ISSUE. ONLY 16 PER CENT OF THE RESPONDENTS HAD EVER ISSUED A PRESS RELEASE AND ALMOST 43 PER CENT OF THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED THAT THEY HAD SPOKEN ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER BEFORE ANY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION DURING THE DESIGNATED YEAR.

TABLE XXX

PARTICIPATION IN CAMPAIGNING ACTIVITIES

| DURING THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 1968 - APRIL 1969): | YES | | NO | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|------|
| | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| 49. HAVE YOU ENCOURAGED ANYONE TO RUN FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD? | 114 | 62.6 | 68 | 37.4 |
| 50. HAVE YOU ACTIVELY CAMPAIGN- ED FOR A SCHOOL BOARD CANDIDATE? | 64 | 35.2 | 118 | 64.8 |
| 51. HAVE YOU WRITTEN A LETTER TO THE EDITOR ON AN EDUCATIONAL ISSUE? | 19 | 10.4 | 163 | 89.6 |
| 52. HAVE YOU ISSUED A PRESS RE- LEASE OR BEEN QUOTED ON AN EDUCATIONAL ISSUE BY THE PRESS? | 29 | 15.9 | 153 | 84.1 |
| 53. HAVE YOU ENCOURAGED ANYONE TO VOTE (FOR OR AGAINST) A SCHOOL CENTRALIZATION ISSUE? | 53 | 29.3 | 128 | 70.7 |
| 58. HAVE YOU SPOKEN BEFORE ANY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION REGARDING AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER? | 77 | 42.5 | 104 | 57.5 |

DIRECT PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES

IN AN AVERAGE ALBERTA COMMUNITY, A SMALL PERCENT-
AGE OF THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS EXERCISE THEIR PRIVILEGE AND
RESPONSIBILITY BY VOTING IN SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS, BUT
ACCORDING TO THE RESULTS OF THIS RESEARCH, 80.66 PER CENT
OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS MAY BE EXPECTED TO
GO TO THE POLLS. IN THE 1968 EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOL
BOARD ELECTION, EXCLUDING EDMONTON SEPARATE SCHOOL

BOARD; 50,595 OUT OF AN ELIGIBLE 181,160 ELECTORS, OR 27.9% VOTED.

APPROXIMATELY ONE-QUARTER OF THE RESPONDENTS SERVED AS MEMBERS ON SUCH ADVISORY COMMITTEES AS POLICY COMMITTEE, CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT RE-ORGANIZATION STUDY COMMITTEE. JUST OVER 18 PER CENT OF THE SURVEYED FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS INDICATED THAT THEY WERE NOW SERVING ON OTHER EDUCATIONAL BOARDS WHICH INCLUDED REGIONAL BOARDS, JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARDS, OR HAD BEEN RE-ELECTED TO THE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD. EVEN THOUGH THERE WAS PROVISION FOR RESPONDENTS TO REPORT ON THE TYPE OF EDUCATIONAL BOARDS THEY SERVED ON AFTER THEIR SERVICE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD IN THE FORM OF AN OPEN-ENDED QUESTION, IT WAS NOT COMPLETED BY RESPONDENTS WHO SAID THEY WERE SERVING NOW ON ANOTHER EDUCATIONAL BOARD. ABOUT 26 PER CENT OF THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED THAT THEY PARTICIPATED IN SPECIAL CITIZEN COMMITTEES OR OTHER ORGANIZATIONS SPECIFICALLY CONCERNED WITH EDUCATION.

TABLE XXXI

DIRECT PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES

| DURING THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 1968 - APRIL 1969): | YES | | NO | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|------|
| | NO. | % | NO. | % |
| 54. HAVE YOU SERVED AS A MEMBER OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BUILD- ING COMMITTEE, ETC.)? | 48 | 26.5 | 133 | 73.5 |
| 55. HAVE YOU SERVED ON ANY EDUCATIONAL BOARDS, E.G., REGIONAL BOARD, JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD, OR BEEN RE-ELECTED TO THE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD? IF SO, WHAT BOARD? _____ | 33 | 18.2 | 148 | 81.8 |
| 56. HAVE YOU ACTIVELY PART- ICIPATED AS A MEMBER OF ANY CITIZENS COMMITTEE OR ORGANIZ- ATION CONCERNED WITH EDUCATION? | 47 | 26.0 | 134 | 74.0 |
| 57. DID YOU VOTE IN THE LAST SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION? | 146 | 80.7 | 35 | 19.3 |

COMMENTS

AT THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE, THERE WAS AN OPEN-ENDED QUESTION FOR RESPONDENTS TO FURTHER COMMENT, QUESTION, OR OFFER SUGGESTIONS WHICH DEAL SPECIFICALLY WITH PARTICIPATION AND FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS. IT WAS IN THIS SECTION THAT MANY OF THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED THAT THEY HAD LITTLE OR NOTHING TO DO WITH EDUCATIONAL MATTERS IN THEIR COMMUNITIES DURING THE PAST YEAR EXCEPT TO VOTE IN SCHOOL ELECTIONS. THEIR LACK OF INVOLVEMENT IS INDICATED BY A SAMPLE OF THE COMMENTS.

"AS THE ONLY WOMAN ON THE SCHOOL BOARD - AND AN EX-TEACHER TO BOOT - I WAS A THORN IN THE FLESH. IT WAS OBVIOUS THAT MOST POLICIES WERE TALKED OVER IN SHOP SESSIONS AND 'ARRANGED' BEFORE THE MEETINGS - WHICH IS WHY I WAS ANXIOUS FOR MY HUSBAND TO REPLACE ME, WHICH HE DID, AND I OPERATED SUCCESSFULLY BEHIND THE SCENES!"

"AFTER SERVING FOR TWENTY YEARS ON THE SCHOOL BOARD, I FEEL THAT I SHOULD BE A GOOD LISTENER AND NOT TALKER OF EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS IN MY COMMUNITY."

"MY HEARING HAS DETERIORATED TO THE EXTENT THAT I CANNOT PARTICIPATE IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS ANY MORE SO I HAVE STEPPED COMPLETELY OUT OF ALL ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL GOVERNMENTS."

"WITH ELEVEN SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEMBERS, THREE OR FOUR SCHOOL OFFICERS IN THE COUNTY OFFICE, A SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS WITH THREE HELPERS, A TV CREW, A BUILDING SUPERVISOR AND HIS CREW, NEARLY 200 TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS, ALL DOING THINGS TO IMPROVE ONLY THEIR OWN POSITION - ONE COULD NOT EXPECT MUCH ATTENTION EVEN IF YOU DID TRY TO OFFER ANY ADVICE OR PARTICIPATE ACTIVELY IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS IN OUR COUNTY."

"I SERVED AS SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER AND SECRETARY ON THE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD FOR TWENTY YEARS. THEN I WENT AS A TRUSTEE TO THE DIVISION. WHEN OUR DIVISION WENT INTO A COUNTY, I WAS DEFEATED BY THE PRESENT COUNCILLOR AND HAVE SINCE BOWED OUT OF ALL EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS BECAUSE I FELT I WAS NO LONGER RESPECTED."

"DURING MY TERM OF OFFICE THERE WAS A GREAT DEAL OF PRESSURE BROUGHT TO BEAR ON THE DEPARTMENT TO CHANGE THE SCHOOL BOUNDARIES AS THE COUNTY OF CAMROSE BOUNDARY IS TWO MILES SOUTH OF BASHAW AND SIX MILES WEST. THIS LEAVES US IN A VERY POOR GEOGRAPHIC POSITION. FAILING HEALTH HAS KEPT ME FROM BEING AS ACTIVE AS I WOULD WISH TO BE BUT IT HAS NOT KEPT ME FROM BEING INTERESTED."

"I BELIEVE THAT OFTEN ELECTED SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ARE THE LEAST QUALIFIED TO MAKE EDUCATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS FOR OUR COMPLICATED SCHOOL SYSTEM. THEREFORE, SINCE RETIREMENT I HAVE TRIED TO BE RETIRED IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF OUR COMMUNITY."

"I FEEL THAT SWITCHING TO A COUNTY SYSTEM HAS RESULTED IN THE DOWNGRADING OF EDUCATION IN OUR AREA. BECAUSE OF A GENERAL APATHY OF THE PUBLIC TOWARDS EDUCATION; SINCE MY RETIREMENT, I HAVE CONCERNED MYSELF WITH THE EDUCATION OF MY OWN CHILDREN RATHER THAN BE CONCERNED WITH EVERYBODY'S CHILDREN IN THE AREA."

"WHEN I RESIGNED AND ENCOURAGED ANOTHER CITIZEN TO SEEK ELECTION TO THE BOARD, I STILL HAD ONE YEAR LEFT ON MY TERM. DURING THE FIRST YEAR, THE PERSON THAT I ENCOURAGED TO RUN AND WHO WAS ELECTED CAME TO TALK THINGS OVER WITH ME. WHILE I DISCUSSED THE PROBLEMS WITH HIM, I WAS MOST CAREFUL NOT TO MAKE ANY OUTRIGHT DECISION FOR HIM."

"HAVING BEEN A BOARD MEMBER FOR ELEVEN YEARS - RESIGNING AND APPLYING FOR A POSITION - AND WORKING FOR THE SAME BOARD - MAKES MY ACTIVE INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION NOW MOST UNIQUE. EVEN THOUGH MY VIEWS ARE VASTLY DIFFERENT THAN THOSE OF THE BOARD AND ITS STAFF, I HAVE LEARNED THROUGH SEVERAL WARNINGS FROM MY EMPLOYERS TO RESERVE MY VIEWS ON ISSUES WHERE MY THOUGHTS DIFFERED FROM THOSE OF MY SUPERIORS."

"I AM STILL INTERESTED IN THE EDUCATION OF OUR YOUNG PEOPLE BUT NOW I FEEL SOMEWHAT HELPLESS AND FORGOTTEN. I REALLY MISS MY ASSOCIATION WITH THE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER, THE SECRETARY-TREASURER, SUPERINTENDENT, AND MOST OF THE TEACHERS."

"MY LARGE FARMING OPERATION TAKES 14-16 HOURS A DAY THROUGHOUT THE SUMMER AND 8-10 HOURS IN THE WINTER. WHEN I WAS ON THE BOARD, I HAD CHILDREN TO HELP ME ON MY LARGE FARM. I HAVE ONLY TWO CHILDREN HOME NOW AND CANNOT LEAVE THEM ALL THE CHORES SO THAT I CAN CONTINUE MY ACTIVE ROLE IN EDUCATION - INASMUCH AS I WOULD LIKE."

"MY AGE IS AGAINST PARTICIPATION TO ANY APPRECIABLE DEGREE."

"MY PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL MATTERS IS NOW LIMITED TO VOTING IN SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS AND ATTENDING ANNUAL MEETINGS."

"THE REASON THAT I AM NO LONGER ACTIVE IN EDUCATIONAL MATTERS IS THAT I NOW DEVOTE MY TIME AND ENERGY TO LODGE WORK AND SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS. I HAVE DONE MY SHARE FOR THE BETTERMENT OF EDUCATION IN OUR DIVISION. IT IS UP TO SOMEBODY ELSE TO DO THEIR PART IN THIS COMPLEX GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY."

"SINCE MY TERM OF OFFICE WAS COMPLETED, THE ONLY PERSON TO SEEK ADVICE OR INFORMATION FROM ME HAS BEEN THE NEW TRUSTEE. THIS BOTHERS ME BUT I SHALL CONTINUE TO TAKE AN ACTIVE PART IN EDUCATION FROM THE SIDELINES OF THE ACTIVITY."

"I ENJOYED MY TERM OF OFFICE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD VERY MUCH BUT DUE TO BUSINESS I COULD NOT BE AS ACTIVE IN EDUCATION AS I WOULD LIKE TO."

"I DON'T TAKE AN ACTIVE PART IN SCHOOL AFFAIRS NOW BECAUSE I FEEL THAT IF I WANTED TO INFLUENCE THE BOARD AND RATEPAYERS THEN I SHOULD HAVE RETAINED MY POSITION. I HAVE CHAIRED AN ANNUAL MEETING SINCE MY RETIREMENT AND I FEEL, AS I HAVE ONLY ONE CHILD IN SCHOOL NOW IN GRADE 12, THAT YOUNGER PARENTS, PERHAPS WITH A MORE MODERN OUTLOOK, SHOULD START TAKING AN ACTIVE PART IN SCHOOL AFFAIRS."

"SINCE RESIGNING FROM THE BOARD, I AM VERY SURPRISED AND DISGUSTED AT HOW LITTLE THE PUBLIC ARE INFORMED OF SCHOOL AFFAIRS. I AM SHOCKED AND EVEN THOUGH I AM MOST INTERESTED IN SCHOOLS, MY ENTHUSIASM IS DAMPENED BY THE INDIFFERENCE AND LACK OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION."

"AFTER I CEASED TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD, ANOTHER MEMBER OF THE BOARD WAS UNSEATED IN AN ELECTION AND BOTH THE SUPERINTENDENT AND SECRETARY-TREASURER RESIGNED. AFTER THESE PEOPLE LEFT, I HAD VERY LITTLE COMMUNICATION WITH THE BOARD OR THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF OF THE OFFICE; AND PEOPLE ON THE STREETS OF OUR COMMUNITY DO NOT GET OVERLY EXCITED OVER EDUCATIONAL THINGS."

"I QUIT THE JOB OF SCHOOL TRUSTEE PARTLY BECAUSE I FELT THAT I WAS NOT ABLE TO GIVE MY FULL EFFORTS TO THE JOB AND PARTLY BECAUSE MY STAND ON A CONTROVERSIAL SCHOOL ISSUE SEEMED TO CONFLICT WITH MY SMALL RETAIL BUSINESS; SO I HAVE NOT BEEN ACTIVE IN SCHOOL AFFAIRS SINCE MY RETIREMENT."

"THERE IS A DISTINCT TREND FOR FORMAL SCHOOL TRUSTEES TO 'DROP OUT OF SIGHT' IN EDUCATIONAL MATTERS. MANY REASONS FOR THIS CAN BE SUGGESTED. IT IS NOT NECESSARILY A BAD TREND. SCHOOL TRUSTEES BASICALLY DO NOT ACCOMPLISH VERY MUCH. A GREAT DEAL OF THE TIME IS SPENT BUT NOT MUCH IS REALLY DONE. THERE SHOULD DEFINITELY BE A MAXIMUM TERM OF OFFICE OF PERHAPS 4-6 YEARS. ANYTHING BEYOND THAT IS VERY DANGEROUS."

"BOTH THE FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL ACTS DISQUALIFY ME, AS A JUDGE, FROM VOTING IN A FEDERAL OR PROVINCIAL ELECTION. APPLYING THIS REASONING, I NO LONGER PARTICIPATE IN SCHOOL ELECTIONS OR SCHOOL GROUPS. I WAS COMPLETELY INVOLVED AS A BARRISTER BUT SINCE MY POSTING AS JUDGE IN CALGARY, MY POSITION REQUIRES THAT I AVOID INVOLVEMENT."

"I HAVE DISCUSSED SCHOOL AFFAIRS QUITE FREQUENTLY WITH THE BOARD CHAIRMAN AND FORMER SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT PARTICULARLY ON ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS, BUT THE AVERAGE PERSON ON THE STREET, RARELY, IF EVER, STARTS A DISCUSSION ON THE PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION, OTHER THAN UNWARRANTLY, BECAUSE OF PERSONALITY CLASHES, DOWNGRADING A PARTICULAR TEACHER OR ADMINISTRATOR."

"TAXPAYERS COMPLAIN BUT TAKE LITTLE ACTIVE INTEREST; PROFESSIONALS, BUSINESSMEN, TEACHERS, ETC. TAKE TOO LITTLE INTEREST IN CURRICULUM; EDUCATORS IN ALBERTA ARE A CONCEITED BREED, FORM A CIRCLE APART FROM PRACTICAL AFFAIRS - REALITY SUFFERS AND THE PROVINCE, IN SPITE OF WHAT IS BEING SAID, IS NOT ABREAST OF THE LATEST DEVELOPMENTS. FOR EXAMPLE, NO SPECIFIC INTEREST IN THE FIELD OF ECONOMY - A NEBULOUS STUDY CALLED SOCIAL STUDIES IS THE CULT. TEACHER TRAINING? WE HAVE TEACHERS IN ART WHO CAN'T PAINT, IN MUSIC WE HAVE TEACHERS WHO CAN'T PLAY, SING, COMPOSE OR IMPART. IN LITERATURE WHO CAN'T WRITE, ETC., ETC., ETC. THE RESULT IS CLOSED SHOP! YET PEOPLE ARE NOT EXCITED ABOUT THE SORRY STATE OF AFFAIRS AND REJECT AN ALL OUT OUTCRY AGAINST ABUSES AND OBSOLESCENCE IN EDUCATION."

WHILE SOME FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS REPORTED THAT THEY WERE NO LONGER ACTIVE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES, OTHER FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS INDICATED THAT THEY CONTINUED TO BE QUITE INVOLVED WITH SCHOOL OFFICIALS, ARE OFTEN CALLED UPON TO GIVE ADVICE OR MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SERVED ON SUCH SPECIAL LAY COMMITTEES AS POLICY COMMITTEE, CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, AND BUILDING COMMITTEE. THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS FROM THE OPEN-ENDED QUESTION ON THE LAST PAGE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE HAVE INDICATED THE ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY SOME OF THE SAMPLED FORMER TRUSTEES.

"I AM INVITED TO THE GRADUATION AND AWARDS DAY PROGRAMS WITHIN OUR DIVISION AND THERE, OVER A COFFEE AND LUNCH AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE CEREMONIES, INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS ON EDUCATION PREVAILS."

"I HAVE USED OPEN-LINE FOR THE DISCUSSION OF EDUCATIONAL MATTERS, CFGP-GRANDE PRAIRIE. I THINK THERE ARE TOO FEW PEOPLE WHO ARE INTERESTED IN ANY ASPECT OF EDUCATION OTHER THAN THE COST, AND UNLESS THEY BECOME INTERESTED IN ALL OTHER ASPECTS THE VALUE RECEIVED PER DOLLAR SPENT WILL FALL FAR SHORT."

"HAVE RECENTLY BEEN APPOINTED AS A MEMBER OF A CONCILIATION BOARD TO TRY AND NEGOTIATE A SETTLEMENT OF A SALARY-CONTRACT DISPUTE BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF MINBURN AND THE A.T.A."

"I BELIEVE, AS AN INTERESTED ADULT, TAXPAYERS AND PARENTS SHOULD BE AWARE OF ALL THE FACETS OF EDUCATION AND BE PREPARED TO WORK TOWARDS WHAT THEY CONSIDER A GOOD WORKING SYSTEM - KEEPING IN MIND COST, CURRICULUM, BENEFITS TO THE STUDENTS (GOOD OR OTHERWISE), STAFFING, HOUSING, ETC. WITH THESE THOUGHTS IN MIND, I ENJOY STRIKING A CONVERSATION ON EDUCATION AT INFORMAL SOCIAL GATHERINGS IN ORDER THAT THE GAP BETWEEN THE SCHOOLS AND THE HOME IS SOMEWHAT SHORTENED."

"I AM A MEMBER OF THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL REPRESENTING THE FARMER'S UNION OF ALBERTA."

"HAVE RECENTLY BEEN APPOINTED TO THE POLICY COMMITTEE OF OUR COUNTY WHERE TEACHER, BOARD, PARENT, AND STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES ASSIST IN FORMULATING EDUCATIONAL POLICY WITHIN OUR COUNTY."

SUMMARY

IN ANALYZING THE NUMEROUS TABLES IN THIS RESEARCH, IT HAS BECOME APPARENT THAT IT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO MEASURE THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION AMONG FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES. THE PARTICIPATION SCORE USED IN THIS STUDY WAS BASED ON THE REPORTED ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS 24 TO 58 INCLUSIVE ON

THE QUESTIONNAIRE. THESE RESPONSES WERE ALSO BASED ON THE RESPONDENTS' OWN PERCEPTION OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS.

TABLES XXVIII TO XXXI INCLUSIVE HAVE PROVIDED THE FOLLOWING FACTS ABOUT FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES:

FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS REPORTED BEING NOT GENERALLY VERY ACTIVE IN INFORMATION-SEEKING ACTIVITIES OTHER THAN INFORMALLY SEEKING INFORMATION OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FROM FRIENDS, RELATIVES, OR BUSINESS ASSOCIATES AND READING EDUCATIONAL PUBLICATIONS.

FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS RARELY VOLUNTEERED THEIR ADVICE OR OPINIONS ON SCHOOL MATTERS TO OTHERS EXCEPT WHEN CONSULTED FOR ADVICE OR OPINIONS BY FRIENDS, RELATIVES, OR BUSINESS ASSOCIATES.

IN PARTICIPATION IN CAMPAIGNING ACTIVITIES, FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ENCOURAGED OTHERS TO RUN FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD BUT WERE GENERALLY INACTIVE IN THE OTHER CAMPAIGNING ACTIVITIES.

FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS INDICATED THAT THEY WERE ACTIVE IN VOTING IN ALL TYPES OF SCHOOL ELECTIONS BUT ONCE AGAIN INACTIVE IN THE OTHER DIRECT PARTICIPATION

ACTIVITIES.

IN GENERAL, IT CAN BE CONCLUDED THAT FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS REPORTED THAT THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES WAS ONE OF LIMITED PARTICIPATION.

CHAPTER VI

SELECTED VARIABLES AND PARTICIPATION

THE SECOND PART OF THIS RESEARCH EXAMINED THE EXTENT OF DIFFERENCES IN PARTICIPATION OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THEIR RESPECTIVE COMMUNITIES WHEN CATEGORIZED ON THE BASIS OF PREVIOUSLY DEFINED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, THEIR SCHOOL SYSTEM, AND THEIR COMMUNITIES.

THE HYPOTHESES RELATING TO THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, THEIR SCHOOL SYSTEMS, AND THEIR COMMUNITIES WERE ORDERED INTO FIVE CATEGORIES. THESE CATEGORIES WERE: (1) OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION, (2) BOARD CHARACTERISTICS, (3) INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES, (4) FACTORS RELATED TO BOARD SERVICE, AND (5) PERSONAL FACTORS.

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WAS USED TO TEST THE TWENTY-THREE HYPOTHESES. AN ALPHA LEVEL OF 0.05 WAS ACCEPTED AS INDICATING A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GROUPS. THE CRITERION VARIABLE WAS THE TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORE WHICH WAS OBTAINED BY EQUALLY WEIGHTING THE SCORES OF EACH OF THE FOUR DIMENSIONS WHICH WERE: (1) INFORMATION-SEEKING ACTIVITIES, (2) ADVICE-GIVING ACTIVITIES, (3) CAMPAIGNING

ACTIVITIES AND (4) DIRECT PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES. WHEN THE FOUR DIMENSIONS WERE EQUALLY WEIGHTED, THEY WERE SUMMED AND THIS SUM REPRESENTED THE TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORE FOR EACH FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER. THE TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORES FOR THE SURVEYED FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THIS STUDY RANGED FROM A LOW TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORE OF 2.001 TO A HIGH PARTICIPATION SCORE OF 6.441.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION

H_1 : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO THE TYPES OF OCCUPATIONAL BACK-GROUNDS.

THE DATA WHICH WERE USED TO TEST THIS HYPOTHESIS ARE PROVIDED IN TABLE XXXII.

TABLE XXXII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY TYPES OF OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUNDS

| OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUNDS | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------|------|
| AGRICULTURE | | 59 | 3.37 |
| MEDICINE AND DENTISTRY | | 16 | 3.68 |
| LAW | | 6 | 3.48 |
| BUSINESS (MANAGERIAL AND PROPRIETOR) | | 72 | 3.56 |
| NURSING | | 2 | 2.93 |
| CIVIL SERVANT | | 5 | 3.81 |
| HOUSEWIFE | | 9 | 5.02 |
| EDUCATION | | 8 | 4.19 |
| LABOUR | | 4 | 3.48 |
| TOTAL | | 181 | 3.60 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 3.19 | 8 | 3.57 | 0.000 |
| 0.89 | 172 | | |

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PARTICIPATION

SCORES WERE FOUND WHEN THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WERE CATEGORIZED BY TYPES OF OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUNDS IN WHICH THEY WERE INVOLVED. INDIVIDUALS WHO WERE EMPLOYED IN MORE SOLITARY OCCUPATIONS GENERALLY HAD LOWER PARTICIPATION SCORES THAN FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO WERE ENGAGED IN OCCUPATIONS IN WHICH THERE IS A GREAT AMOUNT OF PUBLIC CONTACT.

AN EXCEPTION WAS THE MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORE FOR THE OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY OF HOUSEWIFE WHICH WAS THE HIGHEST, EVEN THOUGH THAT EMPLOYMENT MIGHT BE CATEGORIZED AS

A SOLITARY OCCUPATION.

SINCE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE PARTICIPATION MEANS RESULTED BETWEEN THE GROUPS BASED ON OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUNDS, HYPOTHESIS 1 WAS REJECTED.

H₂: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BASED ON THE NUMBER OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH THEY ACTIVELY PARTICIPATED.

TABLE XXXIII PROVIDES THE INFORMATION RELATING TO THIS HYPOTHESIS. THREE GROUPS WERE IDENTIFIED: THOSE IN LESS THAN THREE ORGANIZATIONS, THOSE IN THREE TO FIVE ORGANIZATIONS, AND THOSE IN SIX OR MORE ORGANIZATIONS.

TABLE XXXIII

ANALYSIS BY VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY MEMBERSHIP IN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

| NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONS | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|---------------------------|--|--------|------|
| MEMBERSHIP IN 6 OR MORE | | 20 | 3.79 |
| MEMBERSHIP IN 3-5 | | 92 | 3.70 |
| MEMBERSHIP IN LESS THAN 3 | | 70 | 3.47 |
| TOTAL | | 182 | 3.62 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 1.28 | 2 | 1.30 | 0.276 |
| 0.99 | 179 | | |

NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PARTICIPATION SCORES WERE OBSERVED AMONG THE THREE GROUPINGS UNDER ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP. THEREFORE, HYPOTHESIS 2 WAS ACCEPTED.

H_3 : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO LIVE IN PLURALISTIC POWER-STRUCTURED COMMUNITIES AND THOSE WHO LIVE IN MONOLITHIC POWER-STRUCTURED COMMUNITIES.

THE TWO TYPES OF COMMUNITIES AND THE PARTICIPATION SCORES OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO RESIDED IN THEM ARE COMPARED IN TABLE XXXIV.

TABLE XXXIV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE

| COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|------------------------------|--|--------|------|
| MONOLITHIC POWER-STRUCTURED | | 78 | 3.54 |
| PLURALISTIC POWER-STRUCTURED | | 105 | 3.67 |
| TOTAL | | 183 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 0.77 | 1 | 0.78 | 0.379 |
| 0.99 | 181 | | |

EVEN THOUGH THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO PERCEIVED THE POWER STRUCTURES OF THEIR COMMUNITIES AS BEING PLURALISTIC (105 RESPONDENTS) AND THOSE WHO SAW THEIR COMMUNITIES AS MONOLITHIC (78 RESPONDENTS) IS QUITE LARGE, NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE WAS FOUND IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THE COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE. THEREFORE, HYPOTHESIS 3 WAS ACCEPTED.

H_4 : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO LIVED IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT HAD NOT CHANGED SUPERINTENDENTS SINCE THE TRUSTEES LEFT THE BOARD AND THOSE THAT HAD CHANGED SUPERINTENDENTS.

HYPOTHESIS 4 WAS DEVELOPED SINCE IT WAS FELT THAT COMMUNICATION OPPORTUNITIES WERE ENHANCED WHEN PEOPLE KNEW EACH OTHER AND HAVE WORKED TOGETHER.

ONE QUESTION WAS ASKED OF THE RESPONDENTS IN ORDER TO GET THE NECESSARY INFORMATION FOR THE TESTING OF THIS HYPOTHESIS.

"WAS THE PRESENT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS IN OFFICE WHILE YOU WERE ON THE BOARD?" TWO GROUPS RESULTED FROM THE ANALYSIS OF THE RESPONSES AS SHOWN IN TABLE XXXV.

TABLE XXXV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY SUPERINTENDENT INCUMBENCY

| SUPERINTENDENT INCUMBENCY | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|---------------------------|--|--------|------|
| YES | | 85 | 3.77 |
| NO | | 97 | 3.46 |
| TOTAL | | 182 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 4.21 | 1 | 4.33 | 0.039 |
| 0.97 | 180 | | |

THERE WAS ONLY A SMALL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED THAT THE PRESENT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS WAS IN OFFICE WHILE THEY SERVED ON THE SCHOOL BOARD (85 RESPONDENTS) AND THOSE WHO INDICATED THAT THE PRESENT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS WAS NOT IN OFFICE WHEN THEY SERVED ON THE BOARD (97 RESPONDENTS). A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES WAS OBSERVED BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS. AS A RESULT, HYPOTHESIS 4 WAS REJECTED. WHERE THE OLD SUPERINTENDENT HAD REMAINED IN THE DISTRICT, PARTICIPATION WAS HIGHER THAN WHERE HE HAD BEEN REPLACED.

H₅: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FROM SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF DIFFERENT SIZES.

DISTRICTS WERE DIVIDED INTO THREE SIZES: SMALL (LESS THAN 100 TEACHERS), MODERATELY LARGE (100-500 TEACHERS), AND LARGE (MORE THAN 500 TEACHERS). THE MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES OF THESE THREE GROUPS WERE COMPARED IN TABLE XXXVI.

TABLE XXXVI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT

| SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|-------------------------|--|--------|------|
| SMALL | | 59 | 3.49 |
| MODERATELY LARGE | | 98 | 3.68 |
| LARGE | | 26 | 3.65 |
| TOTAL | | 183 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 0.67 | 2 | 0.67 | 0.513 |
| 1.00 | 180 | | |

THERE WAS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN PARTICIPATION BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FROM DISTRICTS OF DIFFERENT SIZES. THE HYPOTHESIS WAS, THEREFORE, ACCEPTED.

SUMMARY OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION

FIVE HYPOTHESES REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS' OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION WITHIN THEIR COMMUNITIES AND THEIR TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORE WERE TESTED BY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE.

THERE WAS A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE PARTICIPATION SCORE MEANS OF GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY TYPES OF OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS; THEREFORE, HYPOTHESIS 1 WAS REJECTED.

THE DIFFERENCES IN PARTICIPATION SCORE MEANS BETWEEN GROUPS CATEGORIZED BY THE NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONS TO

WHICH FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BELONGED WERE NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE 0.05 LEVEL; CONSEQUENTLY, HYPOTHESIS 2 WAS ACCEPTED.

NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE PARTICIPATION SCORE MEANS WERE FOUND BETWEEN DISTRICTS THAT HAD DIFFERENT LOCAL POWER STRUCTURES. HYPOTHESIS 3 WAS ACCEPTED.

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND IN MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS CATEGORIZED ON THE BASIS OF SUPERINTENDENT INCUMBENCY. HYPOTHESIS 4 WAS REJECTED.

NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND IN MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES BETWEEN FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FROM SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF DIFFERENT SIZES. HYPOTHESIS 5 WAS ACCEPTED.

BOARD CHARACTERISTICS

H₆: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BASED ON THE TYPE OF SCHOOL BOARD.

THE TYPE OF SCHOOL BOARD ON WHICH FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS SERVED AND THEIR MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES ARE ILLUSTRATED IN TABLE XXXVII.

TABLE XXXVII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY TYPE OF SCHOOL BOARD

| TYPE OF SCHOOL BOARD | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|-------------------------------|--|--------|------|
| DOMINATED | | 15 | 3.78 |
| RATIONAL | | 129 | 3.58 |
| SPLIT-VOTE | | 28 | 3.59 |
| DOMINATED/RATIONAL/SPLIT-VOTE | | 10 | 3.86 |
| TOTAL | | 182 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 0.41 | 3 | 0.40 | 0.750 |
| 1.01 | 178 | | |

TABLE XXXVII CLEARLY INDICATES THAT THE LARGEST NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS PERCEIVED THE DECISION-MAKING POWERS OF THEIR FORMER SCHOOL BOARDS AS "RATIONAL". NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND IN THE MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES BETWEEN THE GROUPS. HYPOTHESIS 6 WAS ACCEPTED.

H₇: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO SERVED ON SCHOOL BOARDS DURING A PERIOD OF MAJOR CONTROVERSY AND THOSE WHO SERVED ON BOARDS WHERE THERE WAS NO MAJOR CONTROVERSY.

THE DIFFERENCE IN MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS ARE REPORTED IN TABLE XXXVIII. THE DIFFERENCE IN MEAN SCORES WAS NOT SIGNIFICANT.

TABLE XXXVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY BOARD CONTROVERSY

| BOARD CONTROVERSY | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|-------------------|--|--------|------|
| Yes | | 133 | 3.69 |
| No | | 50 | 3.42 |
| TOTAL | | 183 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 2.68 | 1 | 2.72 | 0.101 |
| 0.98 | | | |

H₀: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO LIVED IN DISTRICTS WHERE EFFORTS ARE MADE BY THE SCHOOL BOARDS AND THEIR ADMINISTRATORS TO KEEP FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ACTIVE AND INTERESTED IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS AND THOSE WHO LIVED WHERE NO SUCH EFFORTS WERE MADE.

EFFORTS TO KEEP FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ACTIVE AND INTERESTED IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES AND THEIR PARTICIPATION SCORES ARE SHOWN IN TABLE XXXIX.

TABLE XXXIX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY DISTRICT ENCOURAGEMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

| DISTRICT ENCOURAGEMENT | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|------------------------|--|--------|------|
| Yes | | 27 | 4.22 |
| No | | 156 | 3.51 |
| TOTAL | | 183 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 11.82 | 1 | 12.66 | 0.000 |
| 0.93 | 181 | | |

A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION OF FORMER TRUSTEES EXISTED BETWEEN DISTRICTS THAT ENCOURAGED SUCH PARTICIPATION AND THOSE THAT DID NOT. MORE PARTICIPATION OCCURRED WHERE IT WAS ENCOURAGED. HYPOTHESIS 8 WAS REJECTED.

H_9 : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BASED ON THE TYPE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT.

THE DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES OF THE RESPONDENTS FROM SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF DIFFERENT TYPES IS SHOWN IN TABLE XL.

TABLE XL

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

| TYPE OF UNIT | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|-------------------------|--|--------|------|
| COUNTIES | | 54 | 3.50 |
| DIVISIONS | | 61 | 3.70 |
| LARGER SCHOOL DISTRICTS | | 68 | 3.63 |
| TOTAL | | 183 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 0.53 | 2 | 0.53 | 0.588 |
| 1.00 | 180 | | |

HYPOTHESIS 9 WAS ACCEPTED SINCE NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES WERE FOUND IN RESPONDENT GROUPS FROM SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF DIFFERENT TYPES.

SUMMARY OF BOARD CHARACTERISTICS

TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORES WERE NOT RELATED TO TYPE OF SCHOOL BOARD, PARTICIPATION IN BOARD CONTROVERSY, AND TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT. HOWEVER, MORE PARTICIPATION OCCURRED IN DISTRICTS THAT ENCOURAGED PARTICIPATION.

INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

H₁₀: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BASED ON THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS PRIOR TO THEIR ELECTION OR APPOINTMENT TO THE SCHOOL BOARDS.

THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARTICIPATION SCORES BASED ON PREVIOUS INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS AND THE PARTICIPATION SCORES OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IS INDICATED IN TABLE XLI.

TABLE XLI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY PREVIOUS INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS

| PREVIOUS INVOLVEMENT | NUMBER | MEAN |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------|------|
| HOME AND SCHOOL OFFICER/LEADER | 63 | 3.70 |
| MEMBER OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY SCHOOL DISTRICT | 4 | 3.64 |
| ATTENDED BOARD MEETINGS | 32 | 3.50 |
| ATTENDED AND SPOKE BEFORE THE BOARD ON SPECIFIC ISSUES | 4 | 3.83 |
| ACTIVE MEMBER OR LEADER OF A CITIZENS' COMMITTEE | 10 | 4.19 |
| FORMER BOARD MEMBER BEFORE FORMATION OF LARGER UNIT | 10 | 3.52 |
| BOARD SECRETARY-TREASURER OF SMALL UNIT | 4 | 3.33 |
| TOTAL | 127 | 3.66 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 0.74 | 6 | 0.75 | 0.612 |
| 0.98 | 120 | | |

NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN PARTICIPATION SCORES WERE REVEALED IN GROUPS CATEGORIZED ON THE BASIS OF PREVIOUS INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS. THEREFORE, HYPOTHESIS 10 WAS ACCEPTED.

H_{11} : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BETWEEN FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO DID NOT BECOME INVOLVED IN OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AFTER LEAVING THE SCHOOL BOARD AND THOSE WHO DID BECOME INVOLVED.

THE DATA USED TO TEST THIS HYPOTHESIS REPRESENTED TWO DIFFERENT METHODS OF BECOMING INVOLVED IN COMMUNITY

AFFAIRS: (1) ELECTION TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL POSITIONS, AND (2) APPOINTMENT TO OTHER POSITIONS OR BOARDS. THE DATA FOR THE TWO DIFFERENT METHODS OF BECOMING INVOLVED IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS IS CONTAINED IN TABLES XLII AND XLIII.

TABLE XLII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY APPOINTMENT TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL POSITIONS

| APPOINTMENT | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|-------------|-----|--------|-------|
| YES | | 50 | 4.02 |
| NO | | 133 | 3.46 |
| TOTAL | | 183 | 3.61 |
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 11.25 | 1 | 12.01 | 0.001 |
| 0.94 | 181 | | |

TABLE XLIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY ELECTION TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL POSITIONS

| ELECTION | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|----------|-----|--------|-------|
| YES | | 38 | 3.91 |
| NO | | 145 | 3.54 |
| TOTAL | | 183 | 3.61 |
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 4.29 | 1 | 4.40 | 0.037 |
| 0.97 | 181 | | |

EVEN THOUGH THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORT-
ED THAT THEY HAD EITHER BEEN APPOINTED OR ELECTED TO OTHER
GOVERNMENTAL BOARDS OR POSITIONS WAS SMALL, THE PROBABILITY
IN BOTH INSTANCES INDICATED THAT THERE WAS A SIGNIFICANT
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PARTICIPATION SCORES AND APPOINTMENT
OR ELECTION TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL BOARDS OR POSITIONS AFTER
SERVICE ON SCHOOL BOARDS; THEREFORE, HYPOTHESIS 11 WAS
REJECTED.

FACTORS RELATING TO BOARD SERVICE

H₁₂: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE
AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF
THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS BASED
ON THE METHOD USED TO SELECT SCHOOL BOARD CANDIDATES.

THE SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IS SHOWN
IN TABLE XLIV.

TABLE XLIV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY METHOD USED TO
SELECT SCHOOL BOARD CANDIDATES

| METHOD USED | NUMBER | MEAN |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|------|
| INDIVIDUAL DECISION TO RUN | 24 | 3.71 |
| ENCOURAGED TO RUN BY GROUP | 78 | 3.56 |
| ENCOURAGED TO RUN BY FORMER TRUSTEES AND/OR ADMINISTRATOR | 18 | 3.23 |
| INDIVIDUAL DECISION AND GROUP ENCOURAGEMENT | 16 | 3.49 |
| INDIVIDUAL DECISION AND ENCOURAGED BY FORMER TRUSTEES AND/OR ADMINISTRATORS | 6 | 3.86 |
| ENCOURAGED TO RUN BY GROUP AND FORMER TRUSTEES AND/ OR ADMINISTRATORS | 17 | 3.80 |
| INDIVIDUAL DECISION, GROUP ENCOURAGEMENT, AND FOR- MER TRUSTEES AND/OR ADMINISTRATORS ENCOURAGE- MENT | 22 | 3.87 |
| TOTAL | 181 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 0.96 | 6 | 0.97 | 0.444 |
| 0.99 | 176 | | |

THERE WERE NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES OF THE RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY METHODS USED IN SELECTING SCHOOL BOARD CANDIDATES.

HYPOTHESIS 12 WAS ACCEPTED.

H_{13} : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN GROUPED ACCORDING TO REASONS FOR RUNNING FOR ELECTION FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD.

TABLE XLV PRESENTS THE SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARTICIPATION SCORES OF THE RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY THE REASONS FOR RUNNING FOR SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION.

TABLE XLV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY REASONS FOR RUNNING
FOR SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION

| REASONS | NUMBER | MEAN |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|------|
| URGED TO RUN BY GROUP | 51 | 3.87 |
| URGED TO RUN BY FRIENDS | 80 | 3.44 |
| FELT IT WAS MY CIVIC DUTY | 33 | 3.90 |
| DISSATISFIED WITH EXISTING SITUATIONS IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM | 12 | 3.25 |
| WANTED TO BECOME INVOLVED IN COMMUNITY POLITICS | 3 | 3.46 |
| TOTAL | 179 | 3.64 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 2.44 | 4 | 2.55 | 0.041 |
| 0.96 | 174 | | |

THE F RATIO WAS SIGNIFICANT AT THE 0.05 LEVEL.

HYPOTHESIS 13 WAS REJECTED.

H_{14} : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN GROUPED ACCORDING TO THE METHOD OF RETIREMENT.

TABLE XLVI ILLUSTRATES THE METHOD BY WHICH FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS LEFT THE SCHOOL BOARDS IN RELATION TO THEIR TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORES.

TABLE XLVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY RETIREMENT METHOD

| RETIREMENT METHOD | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|-------------------------------------------|--|--------|------|
| DID NOT SEEK RE-ELECTION | | 122 | 3.65 |
| RAN FOR RE-ELECTION BUT NOT RE-ELECTED | | 41 | 3.24 |
| RESIGNED | | 16 | 4.22 |
| TOTAL | | 179 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 5.88 | 2 | 6.26 | 0.002 |
| 0.94 | 176 | | |

SINCE CATEGORY FOUR, "RECALLED" HAD ONLY ONE RESPONDENT, IT WAS DROPPED IN THE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS.

THERE WAS A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE AT THE 0.10 LEVEL OF THE PROBABILITY MATRIX FOR SCHEFFE MULTIPLE

COMPARISON OF MEANS:

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----|------|------|------|
| 1. | 1.00 | 0.06 | 0.09 |
| 2. | 0.06 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 3. | 0.09 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

SINCE THE P RATIO WAS SIGNIFICANT AT THE 0.05 LEVEL AND SINCE THE SCHEFFE MULTIPLE COMPARISON OF MEANS TEST WAS SIGNIFICANT AT THE 0.10 LEVEL FOR ALL THESE COMPARISON OF MEANS, HYPOTHESIS 14 AS SUGGESTED WAS REJECTED.

H₁₅: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN CATEGORIZED BY THE TIME SERVED ON THE SCHOOL BOARDS.

TABLE XLVII PROVIDES THE LENGTH OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE WITH THE TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORES EARNED BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THIS STUDY.

TABLE XLVII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY TIME SERVED ON SCHOOL BOARDS

| TIME SERVED | NUMBER | MEAN |
|--------------------|--------|------|
| LESS THAN 2 YEARS | 7 | 3.36 |
| 2-4 YEARS | 45 | 3.37 |
| 4-6 YEARS | 29 | 3.65 |
| 6-8 YEARS | 35 | 3.58 |
| 8-10 YEARS | 18 | 3.68 |
| 10-12 YEARS | 15 | 3.75 |
| 12-14 YEARS | 6 | 4.41 |
| 14-16 YEARS | 11 | 3.89 |
| MORE THAN 16 YEARS | 14 | 3.85 |
| TOTAL | 180 | 3.62 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 1.13 | 8 | 1.13 | 0.345 |
| 1.00 | 171 | | |

THE F RATIO WAS NOT SIGNIFICANT AT THE 0.05 LEVEL;
THEREFORE, HYPOTHESIS 15 WAS ACCEPTED.

H₁₆: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE
AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR
COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN CATEGOR-
IZED ACCORDING TO RECENCY OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE.

TABLE XLVIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY RECENCY OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE

| RECENCY OF SERVICE | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|--------------------|--|--------|------|
| 1961 AND BEFORE | | 27 | 3.52 |
| 1962 | | 16 | 3.25 |
| 1963 | | 11 | 3.13 |
| 1964 | | 20 | 3.47 |
| 1965 | | 24 | 3.56 |
| 1966 | | 18 | 3.75 |
| 1967 | | 27 | 3.60 |
| 1968 | | 38 | 4.08 |
| TOTAL | | 181 | 3.62 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 1.99 | 7 | 2.08 | 0.048 |
| 0.96 | 173 | | |

THE F RATIO WAS SIGNIFICANT AT THE 0.05 LEVEL.

HYPOTHESIS 16 WAS REJECTED. THERE WAS A TENDENCY THAT
THE MORE RECENT A FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER'S SERVICE
ON THE SCHOOL BOARD, THE MORE ACTIVE HE WAS IN THE
EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF HIS COMMUNITY.

SUMMARY OF FACTORS RELATING TO BOARD SERVICE

OF THE FIVE HYPOTHESES SUGGESTED UNDER THIS CATEGORY, THREE HAD STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AND TWO DID NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES WERE FOUND WHEN RESPONDENTS WERE GROUPED BY: (1) REASONS FOR RUNNING FOR SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS, (2) RETIREMENT METHOD, AND (3) RECENCY OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

H₁₇: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN GROUPED BY AGE.

TABLE XLIX REFLECTS THE AGE CATEGORIES IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE PARTICIPATION SCORES AS REPORTED BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS.

TABLE XLIX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY CHRONOLOGICAL AGE OF RESPONDENTS

| AGE OF RESPONDENTS | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|--------------------|--|--------|------|
| UNDER 40 YEARS | | 9 | 4.38 |
| 40-45 YEARS | | 24 | 3.59 |
| 45-50 YEARS | | 48 | 3.60 |
| 50-55 YEARS | | 14 | 4.00 |
| 55-60 YEARS | | 41 | 3.52 |
| 60-65 YEARS | | 19 | 3.40 |
| OVER 65 YEARS | | 28 | 3.50 |
| TOTAL | | 183 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 1.49 | 6 | 1.53 | 0.170 |
| 0.98 | 176 | | |

THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE REVEALED NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES IN RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY AGE. HYPOTHESIS 17 WAS ACCEPTED.

H₁₈: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO ARE CLASSIFIED AS MALES AND THOSE WHO ARE CLASSIFIED AS FEMALES.

TABLE L SHOWS THE SEX CLASSIFICATION IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE PARTICIPATION SCORES OF THE RESPONDENTS.

TABLE L
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY SEX OF INDIVIDUAL

| SEX | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|--------|--|--------|------|
| MALE | | 167 | 3.56 |
| FEMALE | | 16 | 4.22 |
| TOTAL | | 183 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 6.43 | 1 | 6.68 | 0.011 |
| 0.96 | 181 | | |

THERE WAS A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS CLASSIFIED BY SEX. THEREFORE, HYPOTHESIS 18 WAS REJECTED.

H₁₉: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO ARE CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION.

THE ATTAINMENT OF FORMAL EDUCATION BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IS COMPARED WITH THEIR TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORES IN TABLE LI.

TABLE LI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION

| LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION | | | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--------|------|
| BELOW HIGH SCHOOL | | | | 11 | 3.60 |
| SOME HIGH SCHOOL | | | | 68 | 3.29 |
| HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE | | | | 31 | 3.97 |
| SOME UNIVERSITY | | | | 28 | 3.74 |
| UNIVERSITY GRADUATE | | | | 23 | 3.74 |
| SOME GRADUATE WORK | | | | 7 | 4.06 |
| GRADUATE DEGREE | | | | 15 | 3.72 |
| TOTAL | | | | 183 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 2.28 | 6 | 2.40 | 0.029 |
| 0.95 | 176 | | |

THERE WERE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES OF RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION. HYPOTHESIS 19 WAS REJECTED.

H₂₀: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO STILL HAVE CHILDREN IN EITHER THE PUBLIC OR SEPARATE SCHOOL SYSTEMS AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HAVE CHILDREN IN EITHER SYSTEM.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE TWO VARIABLES IS REVIEWED IN TABLE LII.

TABLE LII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY PARENTAL INTEREST

| PARENTAL INTEREST | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|-------------------|--|--------|------|
| Yes | | 91 | 3.61 |
| No | | 92 | 3.62 |
| TOTAL | | 183 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 0.01 | 1 | 0.01 | 0.939 |
| 1.00 | 181 | | |

NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PARTICIPATION
SCORES WERE FOUND BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS.

H_{21} : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO BECAME BOARD MEMBERS THROUGH ELECTION AND THOSE WHO BECAME BOARD MEMBERS THROUGH APPOINTMENT.

TABLE LIII ILLUSTRATES THE METHOD BY WHICH FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS OBTAINED THEIR BOARD POSITION IN RELATION TO THEIR TOTAL PARTICIPATION.

TABLE LIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY METHOD BY WHICH BOARD MEMBER
OBTAINED POSITION

| METHOD OF OBTAINING POSITION | | | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--------|------|
| ELECTION | | | | 170 | 3.64 |
| APPOINTMENT | | | | 13 | 3.31 |
| TOTAL | | | | 183 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 1.28 | 1 | 1.29 | 0.257 |
| 0.99 | 181 | | |

THE DIFFERENCE IN THE MEANS BETWEEN THE TWO
GROUPS WAS NOT STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT.

H₂₂: THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE
AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF
THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO
ONCE HELD THE POSITION OF SCHOOL TEACHER AND/OR ADMIN-
ISTRATOR PRIOR TO THEIR SERVICE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD AND
THOSE WHO DID NOT.

TABLE LIV COMPARES THE PARTICIPATION SCORES OF
FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS CLASSIFIED BY THEIR OTHER
EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE.

TABLE LIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY FORMER EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

| WERE YOU ONCE SCHOOL TEACHER AND/OR ADMINISTRATOR? | | | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|-------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--------|------|
| YES | | | | 22 | 4.10 |
| NO | | | | 161 | 3.55 |
| TOTAL | | | | 183 | 3.61 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 5.84 | 1 | 6.04 | 0.015 |
| 0.97 | 181 | | |

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE MEAN PARTICIPATION
SCORES WERE FOUND BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS. HYPOTHESIS
22 WAS REJECTED.

H_{23} : THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE
AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF
THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN
GROUPED ACCORDING TO THE TIME RESIDED IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

THE TIME RESIDED IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IS COM-
PARED WITH THE TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORES OF FORMER
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO WERE SURVEYED IN TABLE LV.

TABLE LV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
PARTICIPATION BY TIME RESIDED IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

| TIME RESIDED IN DISTRICT | | NUMBER | MEAN |
|--------------------------|--|--------|------|
| LESS THAN 15 YEARS | | 8 | 3.97 |
| 15-20 YEARS | | 15 | 3.74 |
| 20-25 YEARS | | 24 | 3.24 |
| 25-30 YEARS | | 25 | 3.75 |
| 30-35 YEARS | | 16 | 3.98 |
| 35-40 YEARS | | 10 | 3.74 |
| MORE THAN 40 YEARS | | 13 | 3.88 |
| TOTAL | | 111 | 3.70 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-------|
| MS | DF | F | P |
| 1.23 | 6 | 1.16 | 0.335 |
| 1.07 | 104 | | |

THERE WAS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES OF RESPONDENTS CATEGORIZED BY THE TIME RESIDED IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS. HYPOTHESIS 23 WAS ACCEPTED.

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS REVEALED NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHEN CLASSIFIED BY (1) CHRONOLOGICAL AGE, (2) PARENTAL INTEREST, (3) METHOD BY WHICH FORMER BOARD MEMBERS OBTAINED THEIR POSITIONS, AND (4) TIME THAT FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS RESIDED IN THEIR SCHOOL DISTRICTS. THEREFORE, HYPOTHESES 17, 20, 21, AND 23 WERE ACCEPTED AS

PRESENTED.

THERE WERE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE PARTICIPATION SCORES OF RESPONDENTS WHO WERE CATEGORIZED BY (1) SEX, (2) LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION, AND (3) FORMER EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE; THEREFORE, HYPOTHESES 18, 19, AND 22 WERE REJECTED.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

OF THE TWENTY-THREE PROPOSITIONS, TEN WERE FOUND TO INDICATE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES IN FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS CATEGORIZED BY (1) TYPES OF OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUNDS, (2) SUPERINTENDENT INCUMBENCY, (3) DISTRICT ENCOURAGEMENT FOR PARTICIPATION, (4) APPOINTMENT OR ELECTION TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL POSITION, (5) REASONS FOR RUNNING FOR SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION, (6) RETIREMENT METHOD, (7) RECENCY OF SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE, (8) SEX, (9) LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION ATTAINED, AND (10) FORMER EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE.

PARTICIPATION SCORES DID NOT DIFFER SIGNIFICANTLY WHEN FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WERE GROUPED ON THE BASIS OF (1) MEMBERSHIP IN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS, (2) COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE, (3) SIZE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT, (4) TYPE OF SCHOOL BOARD, (5) BOARD CONTROVERSY, (6)

TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS, (7) PREVIOUS INVOLVEMENT IN
EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS, (8) METHOD USED TO SELECT SCHOOL
BOARD CANDIDATES, (9) TIME SERVED ON SCHOOL BOARDS, (10)
CHRONOLOGICAL AGE, (11) PARENTAL INTEREST, (12) METHOD BY
WHICH SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS OBTAINED THEIR POSITIONS, AND
(13) TIME RESIDED IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

THE DUAL PURPOSE OF THIS RESEARCH ON FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WAS TO EXAMINE THE EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES AFTER COMPLETING THEIR SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE, AND TO TEST SPECIFIC HYPOTHESES PERTAINING TO RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND SELECTED VARIABLES.

THE EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION

IN ORDER TO MEASURE THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THEIR COMMUNITIES, THIRTY-FIVE POSSIBLE ACTIVITIES IN WHICH FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS MIGHT BE ENGAGED IN WERE IDENTIFIED. FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE RESEARCH, THE ACTIVITIES WERE CATEGORIZED INTO FOUR GROUPS: (1) INFORMATION-SEEKING ACTIVITIES, (2) ADVICE-GIVING ACTIVITIES, (3) CAMPAIGNING ACTIVITIES, AND (4) DIRECT

PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES. THE TOTAL PARTICIPATION SCORE FOR EACH RESPONDENT WAS ARRIVED AT BY EQUALLY WEIGHTING EACH OF THE DIMENSIONS AND THEN SUMMING THE FOUR EQUALLY WEIGHTED DIMENSION SCORES.

THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TEST WAS USED TO TEST THE TWENTY-THREE SUGGESTED HYPOTHESES. AN ALPHA LEVEL OF 0.05 WAS CONSIDERED AS SIGNIFICANT IN INDICATING A DIFFERENCE.

IN ANALYZING PARTICIPATION IN EACH OF THE ACTIVITIES, THE READER IS REMINDED THAT ONLY RARELY DID RESPONDENTS PARTICIPATE "FREQUENTLY" IN AN ACTIVITY AS PERCEIVED BY THE RESPONDENTS. MOST OF THE POSITIVE RESPONSES REPORTED WERE IN THE "OCCASIONALLY" COLUMN.

VOTING IN SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS WAS THE ACTIVITY IN WHICH THE MOST FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS INDICATED PARTICIPATION (80.7%) AND WRITING A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF A MAGAZINE OR AN EDITORIAL ISSUE WAS THE ITEM LEAST FREQUENTLY CHECKED (10.4%).

ONLY IN SIX OF THE THIRTY-FIVE ACTIVITIES WAS THE PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPATION GREATER THAN FIFTY PER CENT. IN ADDITION TO VOTING IN SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS (80.7%), RESPONDENTS INDICATED THAT THEIR PARTICIPATION WAS GREATER THAN 50% IN THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES: (2) INFORMALLY

SEEKING INFORMATION OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FROM FRIENDS, RELATIVES, OR BUSINESS ASSOCIATES (69.4%), (3) GIVING ADVICE OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS TO FRIENDS, BUSINESS ASSOCIATES, FELLOW WORKERS, OR RELATIVES (70.5%), (4) READING EDUCATIONAL PUBLICATIONS (70.5%), AND (5) ENCOURAGING SOMEONE TO RUN FOR SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION (62.6%).

THERE WERE EIGHT OUT OF THE THIRTY-FIVE ACTIVITIES IN WHICH LESS THAN TWENTY PER CENT OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS HAD BEEN INVOLVED DURING THE ONE YEAR PERIOD WHICH WAS STUDIED. THESE EIGHT ACTIVITIES WERE: (1) ATTENDING MEETINGS OF A LAY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO SEEK INFORMATION OR TO OBSERVE (19.7%), (2) GIVING ADVICE VIA TELEPHONE TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER (16.9%), (3) EXPRESSING THEIR OPINIONS OR GIVING THEIR ADVICE AT SCHOOL BOARD MEETINGS (19.7%), (4) EXPRESSING THEIR OPINIONS OR GIVING ADVICE AT LAY COMMITTEE MEETINGS (18.0%), (5) WRITING A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF A NEWSPAPER ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER (10.4%), (6) BEING QUOTED OR ISSUING A PRESS RELEASE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER (15.9%), (7) SERVING ON EDUCATIONAL BOARDS (18.2%), AND (8) PERSONALLY GOING TO SEE THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS IN ORDER TO GIVE THEIR ADVICE OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS (16.9%).

WHEN DEALING WITH CURRENT SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, SUPERINTENDENTS, AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THEIR COMMUNITY, FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WERE MORE LIKELY TO SEEK INFORMATION ON EDUCATIONAL ISSUES THAN TO VOLUNTEER THEIR OPINIONS OR ADVICE.

FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WERE ALSO A SOURCE FOR ADVICE, OPINIONS, AND INFORMATION ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FOR BOTH THOSE DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THE COMMUNITY AND THE CITIZENS OF THE COMMUNITY. FRIENDS, RELATIVES, AND BUSINESS ASSOCIATES HAD CONTACTED 70.5% OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS. TWENTY-FOUR PER CENT OF THE RESPONDENTS INDICATED THAT THEY HAD BEEN CONTACTED BY THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS FOR ADVICE OR OPINIONS. FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS REPORTED THAT THEY HAD BEEN CONTACTED BY CURRENT BOARD MEMBERS FOR OPINIONS AND/OR ADVICE 39.4% OF THE TIME. FORTY-NINE PER CENT OF THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED THAT TEACHERS HAD CONTACTED THEM FOR THEIR ADVICE OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS.

THE RESPONSE RECEIVED IN THIS RESEARCH INDICATED THAT THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS MAINTAIN AN ALERT INTEREST IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES. THIS IS SHOWN BY: (1) THEIR VOTING RECORD IN SCHOOL ELECTIONS, (2) THEIR ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS OF LAY COM-

MITTEES, AND (3) THEIR ENCOURAGEMENT OF OTHERS TO SEEK MEMBERSHIP ON LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS.

EARLY IN THIS RESEARCH, THE QUESTION OF WHAT HAPPENS TO THE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AFTER THEIR SERVICE ON THE SCHOOL BOARDS WAS COMPLETED WAS ASKED. THE WRITER ASSUMED THAT MANY OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS MIGHT HAVE USED THE ELECTION OR APPOINTMENT TO THE SCHOOL BOARD AS A "STEPPING STONE" INTO HIGHER POLITICAL OFFICE BUT THIS WAS NOT GENERALLY THE CASE. SOME OF THE RESPONDENTS DID ACCEPT APPOINTMENTS TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL BOARDS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY, BUT THEIR SUMMARIZED RESPONSES INDICATED THAT THEY GENERALLY REMAINED CLOSE TO EDUCATIONAL ISSUES WITHIN THEIR COMMUNITIES.

AS WAS STATED EARLIER, THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IS VERY DIFFICULT TO MEASURE; BUT FROM THIS RESEARCH ONE CAN SEE THE TYPES OF ACTIVITIES IN WHICH THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS DO PARTICIPATE.

FACTORS AFFECTING PARTICIPATION

IN THE BELIEF THAT THERE WERE FACTORS RELATED TO FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, THEIR SCHOOL SYSTEMS, AND THEIR COMMUNITIES WHICH MIGHT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP WITH FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS' PARTICIPATION IN

THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES, FIVE CATEGORIES OF VARIABLES WERE ESTABLISHED AND HYPOTHESES RELATING TO THESE AREAS WERE THEN FORMULATED. THE CATEGORIES INCLUDED: (1) OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNICATION, (2) CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD, (3) INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS, (4) FACTORS RELATING TO BOARD SERVICE, AND (5) PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS.

TWENTY-THREE HYPOTHESES WERE SUGGESTED AND THEN TESTED BY THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TEST. THE FINDINGS DERIVED FROM THE TEN HYPOTHESES THAT WERE REJECTED AT THE 0.05 ALPHA LEVEL ARE:

H₁: PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES VARIED WITH THE TYPE OF OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUND THAT THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS HAD.

H₄: PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES WAS GREATER BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHERE SUPERINTENDENTS HAD NOT CHANGED.

H₈: PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES WAS GREATER BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHERE THE SCHOOL BOARD ACTIVELY ENCOURAGED PARTICIPATION.

H₁₁: FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO PARTICIPATED MORE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES TENDED TO BECOME MORE INVOLVED IN OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AFTER LEAVING THE SCHOOL BOARD THAN THOSE WHO DID NOT BECOME INVOLVED.

H₁₃: PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS VARIED WITH THE REASONS FOR RUNNING FOR SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION.

H₁₄: PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES BY FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS VARIED WITH THE METHOD OF SCHOOL BOARD RETIREMENT.

H₁₆: FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAVE SERVED MORE RECENTLY ON THE SCHOOL BOARDS TENDED TO PARTICIPATE GENERALLY MORE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES AFTER THEIR SERVICE ON SCHOOL BOARDS THAN THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO COMPLETED THEIR SCHOOL BOARD SERVICE YEARS AGO.

H₁₈: FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO WERE FEMALE PARTICIPATED MORE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES AFTER THEIR SERVICES ON THE SCHOOL BOARD THAN THOSE WHO WERE MALE.

H₁₉: FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAD A HIGHER LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION BACKGROUND PARTICIPATED MORE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES THAN THOSE INDIVIDUALS WITH LOWER LEVELS OF FORMAL EDUCATION.

H₂₂: PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES WAS SIGNIFICANTLY HIGHER FOR THOSE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAVE A TEACHER'S AND/OR ADMINISTRATOR'S BACKGROUND THAN THOSE THAT DID NOT HAVE SUCH A BACKGROUND.

RECOMMENDATIONS

TODAY, WHEN SO MUCH CONCERN IS FOCUSED UPON THE UTILIZATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES, THE FINDINGS OF THIS RESEARCH STUDY SUGGEST THAT THE ADVICE AND EXPERTISE AVAILABLE IN FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IS NOT BEING UTILIZED FULLY; AND THAT THEY ARE, IN GENERAL, MORE THAN WILLING TO TAKE AN ACTIVE PART IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES. THEREFORE, THE FOLLOWING TWO RECOMMENDATIONS ARE MADE AS A RESULT OF THE FINDINGS OF THIS RESEARCH:

- 1) LAY ADVISORY COMMITTEES SHOULD PROVIDE FOR INCLUSION OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN ORDER THAT THE COMMITTEES CAN SHARE THE EXPERIENCES AND KNOWLEDGE THAT THESE PEOPLE POSSESS.
- 2) SCHOOL OFFICIALS SHOULD BE AWARE OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPATE IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES AND THEY, THEREFORE, SHOULD MAKE PROVISIONS FOR KEEPING THEM ADVISED, INFORMED, AND INTERESTED ON SCHOOL ISSUES. FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ARE OFTEN SOUGHT OUT BY FRIENDS, RELATIVES, AND BUSINESS ASSOCIATES AND IF THEY ARE WELL INFORMED, THEY WILL BE BETTER ABLE TO BRIDGE THE APPARENT COMMUNICATION GAP WHICH APPEARS TO EXIST BETWEEN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC.

AREAS FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH

THIS THESIS EXAMINED THE PARTICIPATION OF FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THE DISTRICTS AND DESCRIBED FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THE SAMPLE. A SCALE OF PARTICIPATION WAS DEVISED TO EXAMINE DIFFERENCES OF PARTICIPATION WITHIN THE GROUP.

THROUGHOUT THIS STUDY IT WAS APPARENT THAT THERE WAS NEED FOR RESEARCH IN AREAS THAT EXTENDED BEYOND THE

SCOPE OF THIS STUDY. SPECIFIC LITERATURE ON FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IS LACKING. THEREFORE, ADDITIONAL STUDIES TO EXPAND ON THIS STUDY WOULD BE MOST WORTHWHILE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

ALMACK, JOHN C. THE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER. NEW YORK:
MACMILLAN COMPANY, 1927.

ASHBY, LLOYD W. THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER.
DANVILLE, ILL: THE INTERSTATE PRINTERS AND
PUBLISHERS, INC., 1968.

CANADIAN ALMANAC AND DIRECTORY FOR 1969. TORONTO, ONT:
COPP CLARK PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1969.

COUNTS, GEORGE S. THE SOCIAL COMPOSITION OF BOARDS OF
EDUCATION. CHICAGO, ILL: UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
PRESS, 1927.

CUBBERLY, E. P. PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION. NEW
YORK: HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO., 1922.

CUBBERLY, E. P. PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES.
BOSTON, MASS: HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO., 1934.

DAWSON, R. M. DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT IN CANADA.
TORONTO, ONT: UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS, 1963.

GARBER, L. O. AND YEAGER, W. A. LEGAL POWERS AND
DUTIES OF PENNSYLVANIA BOARDS OF SCHOOL DIRECTORS.
LANCASTER, PA: BUSINESS PRESS, INC., 1959.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION. STATUS AND PRACTICES OF
BOARDS OF EDUCATION. RESEARCH BULLETIN 24, APRIL,
1946.

STAPLEY, M. E. SCHOOL BOARD STUDIES. CHICAGO, ILL:
MIDWESTERN ADMINISTRATION CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO, 1957.

TUTTLE, E. M. SCHOOL BOARD LEADERSHIP IN AMERICA.
DANVILLE, ILL: INTERSTATE PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS,
1958.

WHITE, A. L. LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS: ORGANIZATION AND PRACTICES. WASH: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, 1962.

B. PERIODICALS

BINZEN, PETER. "HOW TO PICK A SCHOOL BOARD", SATURDAY REVIEW, (APRIL, 1965), PP. 72-84.

BORTNER, DOYLE M. "SELECTING A SUPERINTENDENT", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, (JUNE, 1960), PP.

BOWMAN, T. R. "SELECTING THE SUPERINTENDENT", ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTEBOOK, (FEB., 1956), PP. 1-4.

BOWMAN, T. R. "PARTICIPATION OF SUPERINTENDENTS IN SCHOOL BOARD DECISION-MAKING: DO SUPERINTENDENTS, BOARD MEMBERS, AND PROFESSORS AGREE?", ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTEBOOK, (JAN, 1963), PP. 1-4.

BRICKELL, H. M. "FORMULATION OF SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES", THE SCHOOL BOARD. BANFF REGIONAL CONFERENCE, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, 1951, PP. 17-30.

BROWNELL, S. M. AND CHESTER, S. W. "THE BOARD OF EDUCATION", REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, (OCTOBER, 1946), PP. 316-319.

BRUCE, WM. C. "PERSONAL QUALITIES OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, (MARCH, 1965), P. 72.

BRUCE, WM. C. "THE VALUE OF LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, (JANUARY, 1965), P. 40.

CHARTERS, W. W., JR. "BEYOND THE SURVEY IN SCHOOL BOARD RESEARCH", EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, (DECEMBER, 1955), PP. 449-452.

- COOK, D. H. AND WELCH, C. J. "PORTRAIT OF A GOOD BOARD MEMBER", NATION'S SCHOOLS, (FEBRUARY, 1941), PP. 58-61.
- GROSS, NEAL. "EASING STRAINS AND TENSIONS BETWEEN SUPERINTENDENTS AND BOARD MEMBERS", NATION'S SCHOOLS, (OCTOBER, 1955), PP.
- KRATZMAN, A. "BOARD SUPERINTENDENT RELATIONSHIPS", THE SCHOOL BOARD, ORGANIZING FOR EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA: DIVISION OF EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION, 1965, PP. 5, 6, AND 17-19.
- LEIPOLD, L. E. "THE COLONIAL BEGINNINGS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, (MAY, 1945), PP. 26-27 AND 82.
- MCCARTY, D. J. "ON BETTER BOARD-SUPERINTENDENT RELATIONS", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, (JULY, 1960), PP. 7-8.
- MCCARTY, D. J. "SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERSHIP: WHY CITIZENS SERVE?", ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTEBOOK, (SEPT., 1959), PP. 7, 8.
- PHIMISTER, Z. S. "THE FUNCTION OF THE SCHOOL BOARD", THE SCHOOL BOARD, PROJECTS IN CANADIAN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA: DIVISION OF EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION, 1961, PP. 1-15.
- REILLY, D. M. C. "WHY BE A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, (MAY, 1965), PP. 11-12.
- SPARBY, H. T. "SCHOOL BOARD ORGANIZATION", THE SCHOOL BOARD, PROJECTS IN CANADIAN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA: DIVISION OF EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION, 1961, PP. 32-44.
- WHITE, A. L. "AN ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL BOARD ORGANIZATION", AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, (APRIL, 1963), PP. 7, 8.

C. MISCELLANEOUS

BARNHART, R. E. THE CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERSHIP ON AN ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL INCIDENCE. UNPUBLISHED DOCTORAL DISSERTATION, UNIVERSITY OF BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA, 1952.

AFTER THREE YEARS SCHOOL DIVISIONS IN ALBERTA. ALBERTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 1940.

AFTER TEN YEARS THE ALBERTA COUNTY SYSTEM. ALBERTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 1961.

THE SCHOOL ACT. REVISED STATUTES OF ALBERTA. ALBERTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 1955.

BILL 35: AN ACT RESPECTING SCHOOLS. ALBERTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 1970.

JONASON, J. C. THE LARGE UNITS OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IN ALBERTA. UNPUBLISHED DOCTORAL DISSERTATION, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, 1951.

MCCARTY, D. J. MOTIVES FOR SEEKING SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERSHIP. UNPUBLISHED DOCTORAL DISSERTATION, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 1959.

APPENDIX A

P. O. Box 332
OYEN, ALBERTA
MARCH 26, 1969

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION IN THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION, I HAVE UNDERTAKEN A STUDY OF THE FORMER COUNTY SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND THEIR PARTICIPATION AND INTERACTION IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS WITHIN THEIR COMMITTEES ONCE THEY HAVE COMPLETED THEIR SERVICES ON SCHOOL COMMITTEES.

BEFORE I CAN SURVEY THESE PEOPLE, I REQUIRE SUCH INFORMATION AS THEIR NAMES, PRESENT ADDRESSES, AND THEIR LENGTH OF SERVICE ON THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE. THEREFORE, I AM ASKING FOR YOUR HELP AND CO-OPERATION IN COMPLETING THE ENCLOSED FORM OF ALL SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO HAVE SERVED IN YOUR COUNTY OVER THE PAST TEN YEARS AND WHO AS OF APRIL 1, 1968, ARE NO LONGER ACTIVE ON THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE COUNTY.

AN ACCOMPANYING STAMPED AND SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE IS ENCLOSED FOR YOUR COMPLETED FORM.

TRUSTING THAT I WILL RECEIVE YOUR COMPLETED FORM NOT LATER THAN APRIL 10 AND THANKING YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR VALUABLE TIME, UNDERSTANDING, AND ASSISTANCE, I AM

YOURS TRULY,

MARSHALL DZURKO, B.ED.

ENCL.

| NAME | PRESENT ADDRESS (IF KNOWN) | YEARS ON SCHOOL COMMITTEE | CHECK EACH OF THE FOLLOWING THAT APPLIES TO NAME | | |
|------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| | | | DECEASED | WHEREABOUTS UNKNOWN | STILL IN DISTRICT |
| | | | | | |

APPENDIX B

P. O. Box 332
OYEN, ALBERTA
MARCH 26, 1969

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION IN THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION, I HAVE UNDERTAKEN A STUDY OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THEIR PARTICIPATION AND INTER-ACTION IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS WITHIN THEIR COMMUNITIES ONCE THEY HAVE COMPLETED THEIR SERVICES ON THE SCHOOL BOARD.

BEFORE I CAN SURVEY THESE PEOPLE, I REQUIRE SUCH INFORMATION AS THEIR NAMES, PRESENT ADDRESSES, AND THEIR LENGTH OF SERVICE ON SCHOOL DIVISIONS. THEREFORE, I AM ASKING FOR YOUR HELP AND CO-OPERATION IN COMPLETING THE ENCLOSED FORM OF ALL SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAVE SERVED IN YOUR COMMUNITY'S DIVISIONAL SCHOOL BOARD OVER THE PAST TEN YEARS AND WHO, AS OF APRIL 1, 1968, ARE NO LONGER ACTIVE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD.

AN ACCOMPANYING STAMPED AND SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE IS ENCLOSED FOR YOUR COMPLETED FORM.

TRUSTING THAT I WILL RECEIVE YOUR COMPLETED FORM NOT LATER THAN APRIL 10 AND THANKING YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR VALUABLE TIME, UNDERSTANDING, AND ASSISTANCE, I AM

YOURS TRULY,

MARSHALL DZURKO, B.ED.

ENCL.

| CHECK EACH OF THE FOLLOWING THAT APPLIES TO NAME | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------------------|
| NAME | PRESENT ADDRESS (IF KNOWN) | YEARS ON SCHOOL COMMITTEE | DECEASED | WHEREABOUTS UNKNOWN | STILL IN DISTRICT |
| | | | | | |

APPENDIX C

P. O. Box 332
OYEN, ALBERTA
MARCH 26, 1969

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION IN THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION, I HAVE UNDERTAKEN A STUDY OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THEIR PARTICIPATION AND INTER-ACTION IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS WITHIN THEIR COMMUNITIES ONCE THEY HAVE COMPLETED THEIR SERVICES ON THE SCHOOL BOARD.

BEFORE I CAN SURVEY THESE PEOPLE, I REQUIRE SUCH INFORMATION AS THEIR NAMES, PRESENT ADDRESSES, AND THEIR LENGTH OF SERVICE ON DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARDS. THEREFORE, I AM ASKING FOR YOUR HELP AND CO-OPERATION IN COMPLETING THE ENCLOSED FORM OF ALL SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAVE SERVED IN YOUR COMMUNITY'S DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION OVER THE PAST TEN YEARS AND WHO, AS OF APRIL 1, 1968, ARE NO LONGER ACTIVE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD.

AN ACCOMPANYING STAMPED AND SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE IS ENCLOSED FOR YOUR COMPLETED FORM.

TRUSTING THAT I WILL RECEIVE YOUR COMPLETED FORM NOT LATER THAN APRIL 10 AND THANKING YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR VALUABLE TIME, UNDERSTANDING, AND ASSISTANCE, I AM

YOURS TRULY,

MARSHALL DZURKO, B.ED.

ENCL.

| CHECK EACH OF THE FOLLOWING THAT APPLIES TO NAME | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| NAME | PRESENT ADDRESS (IF KNOWN) | YEARS ON SCHOOL COMMITTEE | DECEASED WHEREABOUTS UNKNOWN STILL IN DISTRICT |
| | | | |

APPENDIX D

P. O. Box 332
Oyen, Alberta

DEAR PAST SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER:

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION, I HAVE UNDERTAKEN A STUDY OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THEIR PARTICIPATION AND INTERACTION IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS WITHIN THEIR COMMUNITIES ONCE THEY HAVE COMPLETED THEIR SERVICE ON SCHOOL BOARDS.

BECAUSE OF YOUR EXPERIENCE AS A FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER IN YOUR COMMUNITY, YOUR ASSISTANCE IN COMPLETING THE ENCLOSED QUESTIONNAIRE WOULD BE MOST APPRECIATED. YOU SHOULD BE ABLE TO COMPLETE IT IN FIFTEEN TO TWENTY-FIVE MINUTES.

THE FIRST PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IS DESIGNED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT YOU, THE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN WHICH YOU SERVED, AND THE COMMUNITY IN WHICH YOU LIVE. PART TWO OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IS CONSTRUCTED SO THAT WE MAY DETERMINE TO WHAT EXTENT YOU HAVE PARTICIPATED AND INTERACTED IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS IN YOUR COMMUNITY DURING THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS.

IN ATTEMPTING TO MEET MY DEADLINE, IT WOULD BE MOST HELPFUL IF I COULD HAVE THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNED BY MAY 20TH. IF YOU CANNOT MEET THAT DEADLINE, PLEASE SEND IT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

INFORMATION WILL BE HELD IN THE STRICTEST CONFIDENCE AND NEITHER YOU NOR YOUR COMMUNITY WILL BE IDENTIFIED.

I THINK YOU WILL FIND THE QUESTIONNAIRE MOST INTERESTING. THANKING YOU IN ADVANCE FOR HELPING ME AND MY FACULTY, I REMAIN

YOURS VERY TRULY,

MARSHALL DZURKO, B.ED.

ENCL.

APPENDIX E

P. O. Box 332
OYEN, ALBERTA
MAY 30, 1969

DEAR FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER:

HAVE YOU COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON "THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER AND HIS PARTICIPATION AND INTERACTION IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS" WHICH WAS MAILED TO YOU DURING THE FIRST WEEK OF MAY, 1969? IF SO, THANK YOU. IF NOT, PLEASE READ ON.

THIS IS A REMINDER TO THOSE OF YOU WHO SO FAR HAVE DEFERRED OR DELAYED RETURNING YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE. YOUR PARTICIPATION IN MY RESEARCH IS VERY IMPORTANT AND NECESSARY; THEREFORE, I URGE YOU TO SEND IT IN AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

IF YOU MISLAID YOUR COPY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE WHICH WAS FORWARDED TO YOU, I WILL BE PLEASED TO SEND ANOTHER ONE. ADDRESS YOUR REQUEST TO MARSHALL DZURKO, P. O. Box 332, OYEN, ALBERTA.

AS I EXPLAINED IN MY FORWARDING LETTER, THE QUESTIONNAIRE IS AN INSTRUMENT DEVELOPED BY ME AND MY THESIS ADVISER TO GATHER INFORMATION FROM FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ON WHAT USE IS BEING MADE OF THE FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS' EXPERIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE IN EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION. YOUR INFORMATION AND OPINIONS ARE SINCERELY SOLICITED AND WILL BE MOST HELPFUL TO ME AND MY UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT.

YOURS SINCERELY,

MARSHALL DZURKO, B. Ed.

APPENDIX F

420

FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS OF THEIR COMMUNITIES

IN THE UPPER RIGHT HAND CORNER YOU WILL SEE A CODE NUMBER THAT WILL BE USED IN THE EVENT A QUESTIONNAIRE NEEDS TO BE FOLLOWED UP. THE LIST OF CODE NUMBERS IS KNOWN ONLY TO ME AND NO ONE ELSE WILL HAVE ACCESS TO THE LIST. THIS ASSURES THAT YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE HELD IN CONFIDENCE AND THAT YOU WILL NOT BE DISTURBED BY FOLLOW-UP LETTERS ONCE WE HAVE RECEIVED YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE.

MAILING INSTRUCTIONS

WHEN YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PLEASE FORWARD IT IN THE ENCLOSED SELF-ADDRESSED STAMPED ENVELOPE TO:

MARSHALL DZURKO
P. O. Box 332
OYEN, ALBERTA

QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: TO BE COMPLETED BY ALL FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO STILL RESIDE WITHIN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT. IF YOU HAVE MOVED FROM THE DISTRICT, PLEASE MARK THE BOX AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE WITHOUT COMPLETING IT. ☐

PART I

1. PRESENT AGE:

 UNDER 40 55-60 40-45 60-65 45-50 OVER 65 50-55

2. SEX:

 MALE FEMALE

3. LEVEL OF EDUCATION:

 BELOW HIGH SCHOOL UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SOME HIGH SCHOOL SOME GRADUATE WORK HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE GRADUATE DEGREE SOME UNIVERSITY

4. OCCUPATION:

(GIVE TITLE OF POSITION, IF NOW RETIRED GIVE POSITION BEFORE
RETIREMENT AND CHECK HERE.) ☐

5. DO YOU PRESENTLY HAVE CHILDREN IN THE PUBLIC OR SEPARATE
SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT? YES NO

6. HOW MANY YEARS DID YOU SERVE ON THE SCHOOL BOARD?

7. IN WHAT YEAR DID YOU LEAVE THE BOARD? _____

8. HOW DID YOU BECOME A MEMBER OF THE BOARD?

_____ ELECTED

_____ APPOINTED

9. WHAT WERE YOUR REASONS FOR SEEKING ELECTION OR ACCEPTING APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD WHEN YOU FIRST RAN? CHECK THOSE THAT APPLY:

_____ URGED TO RUN BY A GROUP. (GIVE NAME OF GROUP.)

_____ URGED TO RUN BY FRIENDS.

_____ FELT IT WAS MY CIVIC DUTY.

_____ DISSATISFIED WITH EXISTING SITUATION(S) WITHIN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM.

_____ WANTED TO BECOME INVOLVED IN COMMUNITY POLITICS.

_____ ENCOURAGED BY A PARTICULAR EVENT. (IF SO, WHAT?)

_____ OTHER. (PLEASE STATE.)

10. WHY DID YOU LEAVE THE BOARD?

_____ DID NOT SEEK RE-ELECTION. (WHY?)

_____ RAN FOR RE-ELECTION BUT NOT ELECTED.

_____ RESIGNED. (WHY?)

_____ RECALLED.

_____ OTHER.

11. INDICATE WAYS IN WHICH YOU WERE ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS IN YOUR COMMUNITY BEFORE YOU BECAME A MEMBER OF THE SCHOOL BOARD?

_____ HOME AND SCHOOL OFFICER OR LEADER.

_____ MEMBER OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY SCHOOL DISTRICT (E.G.,
_____ SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE, ETC.)

_____ ATTENDED BOARD MEETINGS. (IF SO, FREQUENTLY ☐ OR
_____ OCCASIONALLY ☐)

_____ APPEARED AND SPOKE BEFORE THE BOARD ON SPECIFIC ISSUES.
_____ (IF SO, HOW OFTEN?)

_____ ACTIVELY PARTICIPATED AS A MEMBER OR LEADER OF A
CITIZENS' COMMITTEE. (E.G., CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR
_____ BETTER SCHOOLS, COMMITTEE FOR CURRICULUM STUDY.)

_____ OTHER. (PLEASE STATE.)

12. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU LIVED IN THIS SCHOOL DISTRICT?

13. DID YOU EVER HOLD A POSITION AS A SCHOOL TEACHER OR ADMINISTRATOR PRIOR TO SERVING ON THE BOARD?

_____ YES

_____ NO

14. SINCE LEAVING THE BOARD, HAVE YOU BEEN ELECTED TO ANY OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY; E.G., CITY COUNCIL, PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE?

15. SINCE LEAVING THE SCHOOL BOARD, HAVE YOU BEEN APPOINTED TO ANY OTHER GOVERNMENTAL BOARD, E.G., LIBRARY BOARD, HOSPITAL BOARD, ETC?

16. MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS. PLEASE CHECK THE ORGANIZATIONS BELOW IN WHICH YOU ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE:

☐ CHURCH CONNECTED GROUPS LIKE A CHURCH MEN'S ORGANIZATION OR LADIES' SOCIETY.

☐ LODGE OR FRATERNAL (E.G., MASONS, KC, ELKS, EASTERN STAR, ETC.)

☐ CIVIC (ROTARY, LIONS, KIWANIS, JAYCEES, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ETC.)

☐ GROUPS CONCERNED WITH CIVIL RIGHTS OR CIVIL LIBERTIES.

☐ INFORMAL CLUBS OR GROUPS LIKE BRIDGE CLUBS OR SEWING CIRCLES.

☐ WOMEN'S CLUBS OR GROUPS.

☐ FARM GROUPS.

☐ PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (CMA, CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION, ETC.)

☐ LOCAL POLITICAL PARTY ORGANIZATION.

☐ LABOUR UNION.

☐ TAXPAYER'S ASSOCIATIONS OR ORGANIZATIONS.

☐ OTHER. PLEASE LIST:

17. WAS THE PRESENT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS IN OFFICE WHILE YOU WERE ON THE BOARD?

☐ YES

☐ NO

18. HOW MANY MEMBERS NOW SERVE ON YOUR LOCAL BOARD?

HOW MANY OF THE CURRENT BOARD MEMBERS WERE ON THE BOARD WHILE YOU SERVED ON THE BOARD?

19. WHILE YOU SERVED ON THE BOARD WAS THE BOARD SUBJECTED TO ANY PERIODS OF MAJOR COMMUNITY CONTROVERSY?

_____ YES

_____ NO

IF SO, WHAT WERE THEY?

_____ BUDGET AND FINANCIAL MATTERS.

_____ BOARD-ADMINISTRATION CONFLICT.

_____ REORGANIZATION OR CENTRALIZATION.

_____ ACADEMIC FREEDOM.

_____ CURRICULUM MATTERS.

_____ PERSONNEL MATTERS.

_____ SITE SELECTION.

_____ OTHER. (PLEASE STATE.)

20. DOES YOUR DISTRICT PROVIDE ANY ENCOURAGEMENT FOR FORMER SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TO REMAIN ACTIVE AND INTERESTED IN SCHOOL AFFAIRS, E.G., PROVIDING COPIES OF BOARD MEETING MINUTES, COURTESY CARDS FOR SCHOOL ACTIVITIES?

_____ YES

_____ NO

IF SO, WHAT?

21. WHICH DESCRIPTION BELOW BEST DESCRIBES THE POLICY-MAKING PROCESS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD DURING THE TIME YOU SERVED ON THE BOARD? (IF YOU SERVED FOR MANY YEARS THERE IS A POSSIBILITY THAT YOUR BOARD CHANGED THROUGH THE YEARS; IF SO, CHECK THE DESCRIPTION THAT BEST DESCRIBES IT DURING THE LAST FEW YEARS OF YOUR SERVICE.

POLICIES WERE ADVOCATED BY ONE STRONG MEMBER; HE THEN
 _____ CONVINCED OTHER MEMBERS TO SUPPORT HIS POLICIES.

POLICIES EMERGED FROM THE CONSIDERED OPINIONS OF THE
 TOTAL BODY; THE BOARD WAS GENERALLY IN AGREEMENT ON
 _____ POLICY DECISIONS.

POLICIES WERE RESOLVED BY MAJORITY VOTE; THE DECISION
 WAS GENERALLY BASED ON A SPLIT DECISION; E.G., 3-2 OR
 _____ 4-3.

22. THERE ARE TWO EXTREME WAYS IN WHICH DECISIONS ARE MADE IN COMMUNITIES. PLEASE STUDY THE TWO LISTS BELOW AND CHECK WHICH TYPE BEST DESCRIBES THE COMMUNITY IN WHICH YOU LIVE.

_____ TYPE A

DECISIONS INFLUENCED BY ONE
 INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP.

CITIZENS ARE NOT INVOLVED
 IN COMMUNITY PLANNING.

LEADERS DO NOT SEEK
 OPINIONS OF CITIZENS.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ARE
 SELDOM HELD.

_____ TYPE B

MANY CITIZENS PARTICIPATE IN
 THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.

CITIZENS PARTICIPATE IN
 COMMUNITY PLANNING.

LEADERS SEEK THE OPINIONS
 OF CITIZENS.

PEOPLE ARE GIVEN OPPORTUNITY
 TO EXPRESS THEMSELVES AT
 PUBLIC HEARINGS.

23. HOW ARE BOARD CANDIDATES SELECTED IN YOUR COMMUNITY?

_____ INDIVIDUAL DECIDES ON HIS OWN TO RUN.

_____ A GROUP OR GROUPS ENCOURAGE CANDIDATES TO RUN.

_____ INCUMBENT BOARD MEMBERS OR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
_____ ENCOURAGE CANDIDATE TO RUN.

_____ OTHER. (PLEASE STATE.)

DURING THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 1968
TO APRIL 1969):

24. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY TELEPHONED THE
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS SEEKING INFOR-
MATION ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

25. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY TELEPHONED A
MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD
SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT AN EDUCATION-
AL MATTER?

26. HAVE YOU GONE TO THE SUPER-
INTENDENT'S OFFICE SEEKING INFORMATION
ABOUT AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

27. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY GONE TO SEE A
MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD
SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT AN EDUCATION-
AL MATTER?

28. HAVE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED A
TEACHER IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM ABOUT AN
EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

| FREQUENTLY | OCCASSIONALLY | NEVER |
|------------|---------------|-------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

29. HAVE YOU ATTENDED BOARD MEETINGS
TO SEEK INFORMATION OR TO OBSERVE?

30. HAVE YOU ATTENDED MEETINGS OF A LAY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (E.G., BUILDING COMMITTEE, ETC.) TO SEEK INFORMATION OR TO OBSERVE?

31. HAVE YOU INFORMALLY SOUGHT INFORMATION OR OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FROM FRIENDS, RELATIVES, OR BUSINESS ASSOCIATES.

32. HAVE YOU SOUGHT INFORMATION OR
OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FROM
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS DURING
INFORMAL SOCIAL SITUATIONS?

33. HAVE YOU SOUGHT INFORMATION OR
OPINIONS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS FROM
A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL
BOARD DURING INFORMAL SOCIAL SETTINGS?

34. HAVE YOU READ ANY EDUCATIONAL PUBLICATIONS, (E.G., ALBERTA SCHOOL TRUSTEES MAGAZINE, ALBERTA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION MAGAZINE, ETC)?

35. HAVE TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM
EVER CONTACTED YOU FOR YOUR ADVICE OR
OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

36. HAVE BOARD MEMBERS TELEPHONED YOU TO SEEK YOUR ADVICE OR OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

37. HAS THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
TELEPHONED YOU TO SEEK YOUR ADVICE OR
OPINION ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

[illegible]

46. HAVE FRIENDS, BUSINESS ASSOCIATES, FELLOW WORKERS, OR RELATIVES SOUGHT INFORMATION OR ADVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

47. HAVE YOU EXPRESSED AN OPINION OR GIVEN ADVICE ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS DURING AN INFORMAL SITUATION?

48. HAVE YOU EXPRESSED AN OPINION OR GAVE ADVICE TO A MEMBER OR MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ON AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER DURING AN INFORMAL SITUATION?

| FREQUENTLY | OCCASIONALLY | NEVER |
|------------|--------------|-------|
| | | |
| | | |

49. HAVE YOU ENCOURAGED ANYONE TO RUN FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD?

50. HAVE YOU ACTIVELY CAMPAIGNED FOR A SCHOOL BOARD CANDIDATE?

51. HAVE YOU WRITTEN A LETTER TO THE EDITOR ON AN EDUCATIONAL ISSUE?

52. HAVE YOU ISSUED A PRESS RELEASE OR BEEN QUOTED IN THE PRESS ON AN EDUCATIONAL ISSUE?

53. HAVE YOU ENCOURAGED ANYONE TO VOTE (FOR OR AGAINST) A SCHOOL CENTRALIZATION ISSUE?

54. HAVE YOU SERVED AS A MEMBER OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BUILDING COMMITTEE, ETC.)?

| YES | NO |
|-----|----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| YES | NO |
|-----|----|
| | |
| | |
| | |

56. HAVE YOU ACTIVELY PARTICIPATED AS A MEMBER OF ANY CITIZENS COMMITTEE OR ORGANIZATION CONCERNED WITH EDUCATION?

57. DID YOU VOTE IN THE LAST SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION?

58. HAVE YOU SPOKEN BEFORE ANY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION REGARDING AN EDUCATIONAL MATTER?

COMMENTS:

(IF YOU HAVE COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, OR SUGGESTIONS, PLEASE ATATE THEM HERE.)

IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN RECEIVING A SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, PLEASE CHECK HERE. ☐

B29952